DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 047 EC 071 639

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Mulholland, Ann M., Ed.; Cronin, Frances I., Ed. |
| TITLE | Competency Based Teacher Education for the Hearing Impaired: Report of the New York State Conference. (St. Ignatius Retreat Center, Manhasset, New York, May 28-31, 1974). |
| INSTITUTION | New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau for Physically Handicapped Children.; Saint Joseph's School for the Deaf, Bronx, N.Y. |
| PUB DATE | 74 |
| NOTE | 127p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.76 HC-$6.97 PLUS POSTAGE |
| DESCRIPTORS | Administration; *Aurally Handicapped; *Conference Reports; Exceptional Child Education; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *State Standards; Student Teaching; Supervisors; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; Universities |
| IDENTIFIERS | *New York |

ABSTRACT

Reported are proceedings from the New York State Conference on Competency Based Teacher Education (CBTE) for the Hearing Impaired (1974). Chapter 1 includes background information from documents mandating competency based teacher education and certification, and the basic assumptions and objectives of the conference. Presented in Chapter 2 are six papers in which representatives of the state, university, and school administrator points of view discuss conference issues, and answers to questions on such issues as the source of funding and time schedule for achieving CBTE. Chapter 3 outlines the results of workshop sessions in which participants determined the critical issues arising from CBTE and delineated competencies by role (administrators, supervisors, cooperating teachers, university coordinators, and student teachers); recommended practicum guidelines by level of specialization (early childhood, elementary, secondary, and multihandicapped); and explored the implications of CBTE for the Practicum center, the university/college, the consortium, and the student teacher. In Chapter IV the conference is summarized, unresolved issues are enumerated and steps toward consortium formation are listed. (LS)

ED104047

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# PBTE

## for the HEARING IMPAIRED

MANHASSET, N.Y.
1974

2

# COMPETENCY BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

for

# THE HEARING IMPAIRED:

# REPORT OF THE NEW YORK STATE CONFERENCE

St. Ignatius Retreat Center
Manhasset, New York
May 28-31, 1974

Project Director
Ann M. Mulholland

Frances Cronin
Administrative Director

Sponsored by:
The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
Bureau for Physically Handicapped Children

-and-

St. Joseph's School for the Deaf, Bronx
Made possible by funding under
P.L. 89-313

Edited by:

Ann M. Mulholland

Frances Cronin

2A

PREFACE

The Conference on Competency Based Teacher Education for the Hearing Impaired held at Manhasset, New York, May 28 - 31, 1974 resulted from the dual concerns of the Bureau for Physically Handicapped Children and the Coordinators of the programs in New York State preparing teachers of the hearing impaired (deaf and hard of hearing). To initiate the transition from the traditional course - credits - certification requirements to the recently mandated demonstrated competence or performance based requirements established by the Regents in their 1972 Plan for the Development of Post Secondary Education immediate and improved patterns of communication seemed urgent. The university and college coordinators meeting with the Bureau for Physically Handicapped Children in February 1974, delineated the need (1) to clarify the process of program approval and of certification and (2) to establish state-wide dialogue with administrators, teacher representatives, and student teachers. To effect this forum for deliberation between and among the various preparation centers, their respective practica, teachers, and students, a proposal was submitted to and funded by the Bureau for Physically Handicapped Children.

From its inception the Conference reflected the professionalism commonly associated with teachers of the hearing impaired who were willing to convene on relatively short notice and to prepare themselves for discussions of a new concept of teacher education and certification. Their generosity was evident in the sharing of concerns, plans, ideas, competencies, and their commitment to the betterment of education of teachers of the hearing impaired in New York State and nationally.

A conference of this nature is the result of the endeavors of many persons. The Editors duly acknowledge their indebtedness and express their gratitude to: the participants for their unflagging and concerned interest and constructive deliberations;

Richard Hehir who so ably facilitated the dialogue between the new bedfellows in teacher education in New York State;

Professor Margaret Lindsey, Teachers College, Columbia University who made available to the Conferees her lucid slide and taped presentation of C/PBTE and its implications;

Charles C. Mackey, Jr. for his patience and clarity in responding to participant questions;

Ralph Hoag soon to leave New York State for the Southwest for maintaining his interest in local standards and certification;

Leo Connor for his dual role of active participant and succinct and provocative summarizer of the Conference deliberations;

Ms. Joan Armstrong and her staff at St. Joseph's for the efficient conduct of the pre and post Conference communications and details;

the recorders: Gail Pflaster, Daphne Fox, Helena Manrique and Barney Rankhorn assisted by Mary Louise Roberts, Tony Massa, Pat Weisbrod, Donna D'Amato, and James Newman who responsibly reported the discussions; and

the 1974 graduates for their provocative and refreshing contributions.

October 15, 1974

Ann M. Mulholland

Frances I. Cronin

Table of Contents


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Preface | iii |
| Chapter I - Introduction | 1 |
| Background | 1 |
| Assumptions | 6 |
| Objectives | 6 |
| Chapter II - Competence Based Teacher Education: The Issues | 8 |
| Orientation to the Conference - Frances I. Cronin | 8 |
| Greetings from the State Education Department - Charles C. Mackey, Jr. | 12 |
| The State Level - Richard G. Hehir | 14 |
| The University Perspective - Ann M. Mulholland | 33 |
| The School Administrator's Point of View Ralph L. Hoag | 45 |
| The Role of the State in CBTE - Charles C. Mackey, Jr. | 50 |
| Questions to the Panelists | 69 |
| Chapter III - Deliberations of Conferees | 80 |
| By Role: | |
| The Issues | 80 |
| Delineated Competencies | 85 |
| By Levels of Specialization | 89 |
| By Consortium | 93 |
| Chapter IV - Summary of the Conference - Leo Connor, Ed.D. | 98 |
| Appendix A - Program | 110 |
| Appendix B - Participants | 114 |
| Appendix C - Tentative Consortia | 117 |
| Appendix D - Bibliography | 119 |
| Appendix E - Entry and Terminal Behaviors Assessment | 120 |
| Appendix F - Evaluation | 122 |

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

## Background

The initiation of competency based teacher education and certification in New York State has resulted in the issuance of a number of documents describing the mandate, the format for submission of a proposal by the institution of higher education, and the departmental review of proposals.

The following excerpts constitute the bases for the interpretative presentations, the exploratory discussions, and the tentative guidelines produced by the participants of the conference on CBTE for the hearing impaired.

## Teacher Education Program Proposals*

The Teacher Education and Certification Section of the 1972 Regents Plan for the Development of Post Secondary Education identifies a specific goal and several underlying convictions, regarding the future of the certification of professional personnel. These statements have implications for preparatory programs leading to State certification.

The Regents' goal and the relevant underlying convictions are as follows:

Goal:

> To establish a system of certification by which the State can assure the public that professional personnel in the schools possess and maintain demonstrated competence to enable children to learn.

*Teacher Education Program Proposals. Division of Teacher Education and Certification. The State Education Department. July 1, 1974.

Underlying convictions:

The basis for certification should be teacher competence rather than total reliance on college courses. Possession of a State certificate should represent an acceptable level of competence in general background knowledge, subject matter knowledge, and teaching skill. The preparation of teachers should involve a number of pertinent agencies and individuals including: schools, higher institutions, professional staffs, and relevant agencies. The ideal professional training would integrate theoretical understanding and clinical experience in a system of mutual correction and reinforcement.

New York State defines a competence based program of preparation as one which provides acceptable evidence that, through the collaborative efforts of representatives of colleges and universities, school districts, and professional staff of school districts, there exists:

1. An analysis and statement of the roles, responsibilities, and functions of the professional positions for which persons are being prepared.
2. A readily available statement of the skills, knowledge, and attitudes expected of program graduates, stated as explicitly and objectively as possible.
3. A statement of what constitutes acceptable evidence of the attainment of the expected skills, knowledge, and attitudes as well as the standards and conditions by which the evidence is gathered.
4. An instructional program which is congruent with the expected outcomes.
5. A means by which the program is monitored, evaluated, and modified in light of the evaluation.

A competence based system permits the widest variety of program design since it does not prescribe any set of courses of learning activities.

In the view of the State Education Department, competencebased teacher education is a means of preparing school personnel which requires preparatory programs to state the explicit objectives and criteria that are to be met by students before they are recommended for certification. Competence based teacher education further assumes that teachers-in-training will engage in a flexible instructional program designed to allow individuals to develop and acquire the skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary to meet the designated exit criteria. The term implies that assessment procedures are related to instruction and that the procedures incorporate conditions of performance and designated levels of mastery.

## Legal Basis for Program Approval

Section 80.2 (k) of the Regulations of the Commissioner, reprinted below, serves as the governing regulation for the approval and registration of programs.

### Certification by Completion of an Approved Program of Preparation

A teaching certificate may be issued to a candidate who has complete preparation at an institution or institutions having a program for the preparation of teachers or other school personnel registered and/or approved by the State Education Department providing the candidate is recommended for that certificate by the institution or institutions where the program was completed. Programs for which registration is sought will be evaluated according to standards and procedures determined by the commissioner.

The State Education Department approves, through a process called registration, collegiate programs for preparation and certification of personnel for public school service, and persons recommended by registered colleges are subsequently issued a State certificate. Program approval takes place in three states: preliminary, conditional, and continuing registration. A college seeking to establish a new or significantly revised preparatory program must submit a complete proposal. A satisfactory proposal is given preliminary registration during which persons completing the program may be recommended for certification. During the period of preliminary registration a site visit will be conducted te ascertain the program's eligibility for conditional registration. The final stage, continuing registration, is granted for five years. Proposals submitted for preliminary registration after September 1, 1973, must provide the information requested in the directions which follow.

The proposal format, in accordance with the Regents' Plan, calls for the significant functional involvement of higher education institutions, school districts, and the professional staff of school districts.

The Regents' Plan notes that "the ideal professional training would integrate theoretical understanding and clinical experience in a system of mutual correction and reinforcement." The Plan calls for significant, functional involvement of pertinent agencies. The Department's intent is to reassure the public that theory, academic content, and professional practice are interwoven to ensure both breadth and realism.

Section III of the proposal format states that a description of the agreement between the parties at interest will be used by the Department to identify the necessary involvement. The information which is required does

not prescribe <u>how</u> collaboration is to be achieved or verified; the information will indicate what collaboration means in the program being submitted.

By Regulation as well as by tradition, the Department considers the institution of higher education as the primary vehicle for the preparation of professional staff. Nothing in the conditions stated above is intended to suggest that the collaboration required in the preparation of staff members must be an activity shared <u>equally</u> by the parties at interest although such an arrangement could be one model.

* * * *

Elements of the program to be addressed by the proposal include the following:

A. An analysis and statement of the position for which persons are being prepared.

B. Requirements, if any, for entrance into the Teacher Education Program.

C. Expected skills, knowledge and attitudes.

D. Assessment: procedures, conditions, criteria for success.

E. Student guidance

F. Program evaluation and management.

(The above information is an expansion of earlier New York State communications and is used in the report to prevent confusion.)

To facilitate the transition from traditional to competence based teacher education, the Conference was designed and conducted.

## Assumptions

The basic assumption upon which the Conference was convened was that there was a desire on the part of school and program administrators, college and university coordinators involved in pre and in-service education of teachers, teachers themselves, student teachers, and the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification to meet in order to articulate the components of Performance Based Teacher Education and its implications for teacher educators and educators of hearing impaired children and youth in New York State.

A second assumption was that the deliberations and thoughtful recommendations of this group would significantly assist those responsible for the total New York State certification process as it related to teachers of the hearing impaired.

## Objectives

To this end the objectives of the Conference in Competence based teacher Education were to:

1. Develop awareness of PBTE and its characteristic components;
2. Provide opportunity to discuss competence based teacher preparation and its implications for teacher education by role, by level, and by consortium;
3. Delineate and explore key issues in the development of PBTE programs and standards of certification;

4. Initiate consortia planning to meet New York State certification standards; and
5. Outline tentative guidelines for practicum at varying specialization levels congruent with college/university specialization and field needs.

# CHAPTER II

## COMPETENCY BASED TEACHER EDUCATION: THE ISSUES

### ORIENTATION TO THE CONFERENCE

Frances I. Cronin
Superintendent
St. Joseph's School for the Deaf

On behalf of the Bureau for Physically Handicapped Children and in the name of the CBTE Steering Committee, I welcome you to Manhasset and our first conference on Competency Based Teacher Education. I suspect that there will be other conferences, if not on such a grand scale, at least on a local basis.

Several months ago representatives from the various colleges/universities engaged in preparing teachers of the deaf met in Albany with representatives from the State Education Department at the Bureau for Physically Handicapped Children. The purpose of that meeting was to initiate activity at the college/university level in light of the Board of Regents' Master Plan for the preparation and practice of professional personnel in the schools. The Regent's goal for this Master Plan is

> to establish a system of certification by which the State can assure the public that professional personnel in the schools possess and maintain demonstrated competence to enable children to learn.

The timetable established by the Regents as it touches our particular field

of preparation of teachers in special education is just eight short months away. Our days here, hopefully, will clarify this "deadline date" and its implications at the college/university level and the practicum center level.

Just briefly, February 1, 1975, is the date in the Regents' timetable by which a field-centered, competency-based, consortium-planned teacher preparation program must be written and submitted to the State Education Department. These terms "field-centered, competency-based, consortium-planned" will be the focus of much of our discussion during the conference, so don't feel anxious about being "unprepared." At least one of our program goals, the first one, would be unnecessary if everyone here were completely prepared.

Subsequent to approval of a given teacher preparation program, certification of graduates will rest with the approved college or university which will testify to the competency of its graduates "to enable children to learn." For us, this means that by February 1976, new teachers leaving college as beginning professionals will no longer be certified by the State Education Department. Such certification will be granted by the approved preparatory institution of higher learning as the individual student demonstrates his or her competence to teach so that children learn.

Dr. Hehir and Dr. Mackey, I am sure, will clarify the demands of these dates as they relate to our specific roles in the total program of teacher preparation. I will leave it to them, to the reading material provided in your folder--and to your discussions.

In order to facilitate discussion and pinpoint our attention on the main elements of competency-based teacher education (CBTE), sometimes called

performance-based teacher education (PBTE), we, the Committee, planned that each major presentation should be followed by a discussion based on "role-alike" groups, "level-alike" groups, and "consortium" groups. During these talks and discussions it is hoped that the key issues of CBTE will be delineated and explored in a helpful manner, because they touch upon actual life situations and interests in the profession.

Consortium groups have been arbitrarily assigned to familiarize participants with the "makeup" of a consortium. Namely, each consortium consists of a college or university coordinator of the teacher preparation program, an administrator of a practicum center or school district, a cooperating teacher, a college/university and a school supervisor of practicum, and a graduate student of the teacher education program. Sheets will be given out which will clarify this for our first consortia groups discussion this evening.

Role-alike groups means just that. Those whose current roles are alike will meet and discuss the questions proposed on the guidesheets. In other words: Administrators will meet; cooperating teachers will meet--each professional peer group will meet to explore the implications and the issues which arise from implementation of CBTE as they are perceived from within the given role.

We are color-coded for discussion guides each day and these guidesheets provide a brief bibliography to be pursued here--or at home--preferably here for a more enlightened discussion. All materials listed are available in the conference folders and our point of departure will be from the papers presented in the course of the three days.

There are two changes in the program as it exists. Dr. Margaret Lindsey cannot be with us on Thursday. She has, however, graciously loaned us a slide presentation which she has just completed preparing. In this way, while we will miss her dynamic presentation, we share her vast knowledge of and experience in developing teaching competencies.

The second change is an admission that in our missionary fervor we reached for more than we can possibly grasp in three days, and I will not present a paper on evaluation of competencies. Instead, the time for consortia groups discussion on Thursday evening will be extended.

It is the sincere hope of the Steering Committee that these three days will provide a meaningful, shared, professional experience which will help to clarify a new and improved system of teacher certification towards which the Regents direct us.

# GREETINGS FROM THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Charles C. Mackey, Jr., Ed.D.
Associate Teacher Certification
Division of Teacher Education and Certification

Truly, I am happy to be with you this morning and to bring you greetings from the Division of Teacher Education and Certification and happier still that I can spend a few hours with you in some of your deliberations. I consider this movement to be a very exciting and innovative endeavor in teacher education, and as those responsible for the preparation and education of tomorrow's teachers who will subsequently be responsible for the education of God's children, you are in the vanguard of the new movement--a transformation in the process of preparing tomorrow's teachers. Precious little in the history of teacher education in New York State parallels the plan envisioned by the Regents in their 1972 quadrennial master report dealing with the preparation of education personnel. The plan which has been subsequently laid bare over the last 18 months indicates that together we will develop and implement a curricular pattern which is both public and explicit and which is derived from the roles and responsibilities which we expect each of the State's professionals to execute.

Hopefully, your efforts here over these three days will set the stage for an on-going collaborative effort, one which may well establish patterns worthy of being replicated by your colleagues in other certification areas. By your disposition to participate in this activity, you have shown a willingness to consider and explore a new approach to teacher education. My hope

is that the fruits of your discussion and interactions will bring New York State closer to an educational system by which the State can insure the public that the professional personnel in the schools possess and maintain a demonstrated competency, that is the skills, attitudes, and knowledges to enable children to learn.

# COMPETENCY BASED TEACHER EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS OF THE DEAF: THE ISSUES FROM THE STATE LEVEL

Richard G. Hehir, Ed.D.
Chief, Bureau for
Physically Handicapped Children
The State Education Department

All elementary and special education teacher preparation programs in New York State seeking state approval for certification of school personnel must submit competency based, field centered proposals by Feburary, 1975. The five institutions of higher education preparing teachers of the deaf must collaborate with school administrators and representatives of the teachers in forming consortia which will develop the competencies needed by the teachers and evidence that the teachers have achieved these competencies. Since deaf children are being provided with a number of optional educational environments, the competencies needed by teachers in these various settings may demand different and varied preparation. The Council on Education of the Deaf has recognized the need for differentiated training at various levels,but there is also need to recognize the alternative educational settings and programs being developed in the public school sector for deaf children. The colleges and universities preparing teachers of the deaf must develop the competencies needed by teachers to meet the needs of deaf children wherever they are being educated.

The Board of Regents in New York State has mandated that institutions of higher education preparing elementary and special education teachers utilize a competency based, field centered approach beginning in February, 1975. Competency based teacher education is a different approach to the

training of teachers. It involves collaboration between the university preparing teachers and the communities in which the teachers will serve. This new process for certification by the state has as its goal an assurance to the public that professional personnel in the schools possess and maintain demonstrated competence to enable children to learn. Teachers preparing to teach deaf children are included in the category of special education teachers who will be prepared on a competency base. Five institutions of higher education prepare teachers of the deaf within New York State. These teachers are involved in infant education (ages 0-3) to adult education. The competencies needed by these teachers of the deaf continually change and expand as the programs develop to meet the needs of deaf children regardless of where they are served. Let us look at some of the factors involved in this new process.

Present Procedure for Certification of Teachers

We should outline what the present procedure is for granting New York State certification of teachers. As you know, the State has the legal authority to grant teacher certification and this authority is administered by the State educational agency. The college or university submits to the State Education Department its course descriptions and number of hours in the sequence of study it will require of its students. This program, along with faculty qualifications, library holdings, etc. is reviewed and approved, if in order, by the State Education Department. When the student completes a university program the State will grant certification.

At the present time, permanent certificates for teaching classes for physically handicapped children, including classes of deaf children or youth,

are dependent upon the issuance of a basic teaching certificate by the Department. This means that a teacher must have a valid teaching certificate to teach "normal" children (issued after achieving a bachelors degree). Then upon completion of a minimum of 24 hours of specialized graduate work in the teaching of deaf children, that teacher may have an extension certificate issued by the Department. The teacher, for example, might have a permanent basic teaching certificate in elementary education, and then upon the completion of a minimum of 24 hours of graduate study in the education of the deaf, be issued a permanent extension certificate to teach classes of deaf children and youth.

If the student has completed an approved program in a college or university, a blue certificate is issued by the Department upon recommendation of the university. If the student has completed courses in specific areas and has achieved the minimum semester-hour credits required in several institutions, a white certificate is issued. The white certificate is issued by the Department upon evaluation of a transcript.

There are a number of extension certificates in special education besides the one pertaining to deaf children. New York State also has extension certificates for teaching: the orthopedically handicapped and the cerebral palsied, partially seeing children or youth, and blind children. There are other special education requirements for teaching the mentally retarded also.

The New Competency Based Certification

The above system of certifying teachers in special education, as well as in elementary education, will be changed, beginning in February of 1975. In special education, including the area of the deaf, by February of 1976,

one year after the initiation of the competency program, individual teaching certificates will no longer be issued by the State Education Department. After February, 1976 all special education certificates will be issued upon the recommendation of the institution of higher education having an approved program. By 1980 the State Education Department will no longer issue any teaching certificates by reviewing individual transcripts.

The State of New York, as well as many other states, is moving to a competency based preparation of teachers in four areas in special education. These areas include preparation as a teacher of special education, preparation as a teacher of the speech and hearing handicapped, preparation as a teacher of the deaf, and preparation as a teacher of the blind and visually handicapped.

If a college or university wishes to offer a teacher preparation program in one of the four areas mentioned after February of 1975, the college must become involved in a new process to gain State approval of its program proposal. This process is very different from the method used by colleges to obtain approval presently. The participants at this Conference include college and university representatives involved in the teacher preparation programs for teachers of the hearing impaired, school administrators who employ graduates of the teacher preparation programs, and teachers who are products of these preparation programs. These "role-alike" groups were selected deliberately since they comprise state mandated consortia members who must cooperate if a college teacher preparation proposal is to be accepted by the State after February of 1975. A policy board made up of the college and university staff, the employing school administrator, and representatives of the teachers association must collaboratively develop

the program proposal which will be submitted to the State for approval. Students and parents of handicapped children and perhaps even the consumers of the educational program could also be involved in this consortia for the valuable input they might make. We have students participating in this conference for that reason. The State is concerned with the process in which the colleges and universities engage in developing a program proposal which they will submit for State approval. Some of the components of the program proposal which must be included are: the goals of the preparation program, evidence that the goals are derived from the role and function of professionals on the job, evidence that the students achieve the goals through some process of evaluation, and an indication of how the program may be modified as it develops. Competencies of the teachers who are prepared in the program must be indicated and made public. The college, after the program is approved by the State, will be subject to visitation by the State Education Department and the college program will be reviewed every five years.

The college will recommend that the State issue a certificate for those students who have met the established criteria. A portfolio indicating the competencies which teacher-trainees have developed, will be sent from the college to the employing school administrator to aid him in employing capable teachers to meet the needs of his students. This movement is a dramatic shift from the certification process which was outlined at the beginning of this paper.

Council on Education of the Deaf Standards

The Council on Education of the Deaf (CED) has also established revised standards for certification by that national professional organization. The

old Class A and Class B certification issued by the Conference of Executives of the American Schools for the Deaf is being replaced under a new process by the CED certificate. Also of importance is the approval of a teacher preparation program by that organization in cooperation with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The CED standards for certification of teachers of the hearing impaired has adapted the recommendations made at the Virginia Beach Conference which was concerned with the preparation of teachers of the deaf, and which was held in 1964. The CED standards now address themselves to areas of specialization in teacher preparation and also to the competencies and knowledge which teachers of the hearing impaired should possess in order to obtain either provisional or professional certification by CED.

Undoubtedly the colleges and universities will wish to consider these CED levels of specialization as they develop their competency based programs for State approval. CED speaks to a minimum number of semester hours for provisional and professional certification. The State is not concerned with number of hours of course work, but rather is interested in seeing the competencies, the skills, attitudes, and knowledge which will be achieved by the teachers upon the completion of an approved program. Re-wording existing course descriptions to indicate competencies will not be looked upon favorably by the State. What is being demanded is that the colleges collaborate with the school administrators and teachers and perhaps others to define the competencies needed by teachers. This consortium must determine how these competencies will be demonstrated and evaluated so that an employing school administrator and the public at large may be assured that the teacher trained in a college is capable and qualified to teach

handicapped children. This process will be difficult and will demand much time and effort on the part of the staff of the university, school staff, and teachers if it is to be successful.

Conference Planning

These movements by CED and by the states to shift to competency based preparation are, to my mind, not in conflict with each other. They do present many problems to colleges and universities, to school administrators, to teachers and others involved in the educational process for hearing handicapped children. It was on this basis, and after having attended a CED small group conference on the evaluation of teacher preparation programs held at Gallaudet College last December, that the Bureau for Physically Handicapped Children decided it might be advisable to bring together the colleges and universities preparing teachers of hearing impaired children in New York State who were involved in developing competency proposals, to discuss these movements and to determine what might be desirable steps to take in the future. As a result, in Feburary of 1974 the Bureau invited representatives from the institutions of higher education preparing teachers of the hearing impaired, to a meeting in Albany to pursue the desirability of cooperative discussion and planning. Representatives of four colleges and universities attended the meeting. It was decided that a conference of three days duration be held at which an opportunity would be presented for an in-depth review of competency based preparation by those most directly affected: the institutions of higher education, the employing school administrators, and the teachers of the deaf. Professor Ann Mulholland of Teachers College, Columbia University and Ms. Frances Cronin, Superintendent of St. Joseph's School for the Deaf, offered to direct and administer the conference. The

Bureau for Physically Handicapped Children offered to sponsor it financially. This conference of fifty-three participants represents the first time that colleges in New York State, preparing teachers of the deaf, have been brought together among themselves with administrators of schools for the deaf, both public and private, with teachers to discuss a topic of great concern to all.

Developments Affecting Special Education

What are some of the developments which are affecting the field of special education, including the hearing impaired, either directly or indirectly? These developments have both positive and negative aspects and relate to our concern for competency based teacher preparation.

New York State's Fleischmann Commission Report (1972) indicated that 50% of the handicapped children in New York State are not being served. That report also charged that over 80% of the hearing impaired in this State are not receiving an adequate program. The Board of Regents of the State of New York has recently issued a Position Paper (1973) which indicates that the public school districts must assume full responsibility for the education of handicapped children and provide for the services not now available. The Regents recognize the contribution which private schools have made in the education of handicapped children, but they also recognize that handicapped children should have alternative educational programs available to them which insure that the program fits the child, not the child fitting the program. There is recognition further in the Regents' Position Paper that there is need for developing and expanding existing programs to provide more viable options for all handicapped children, including the deaf and the hearing impaired.

The mainstreaming of handicapped children is a movement especially appealing to parents. Mainstreaming to some means placing the handicapped child into a regular class and, if necessary, providing whatever supportive services are necessary for him to succeed there. The Council for Exceptional Children at its national conference in April, 1973 issued a policy statement endorsing the cascade system of services to handicapped children which would move the handicapped child to the least restrictive educational environment and services as quickly as possible. We have certain agencies within New York State which are promoting the mainstreaming concept for institutionalized children which has resulted in some of the most severely handicapped children being placed in the community with the public schools being expected to provide educational services.

Couple this movement with the recent legislative decisions which have emanated from our courts and which directly affect the educational programs for handicapped children. A landmark case is the PARC decision (Abeson, 1972) in the State of Pennsylvania in which it was decided that handicapped children have the right to a free public education regardless of the severity of their handicapping condition. It was adjudged also that the child or his parents or guardian have a right to due process procedures as they pertain to the educational placement provided to their handicapped child. Parents are petitioning the courts as well as the Commissioner of Education regarding the rights of handicapped children. The Commissioner of Education in New York State has recently ruled that the City of New York must provide suitable public school educational programs to handicapped children in that city now on waiting lists or attending other schools, and that the city must provide a plan for dealing with this problem and which

plan must be agreeable to the Commissioner. The Commissioner was recently petitioned in regard to a case in Syracuse wherein the parents of deaf children requested local programming for their children in lieu of attendance at special residential schools for the deaf. Parents are not satisfied merely with a program or with existing services and schools but rather are seeking quality in a free public school educational environment for their children.

Another movement of concern is the action of the New York State Legislature in the enactment of Chapter 241 of the Laws of 1974. This legislation provides categorical state aid to local public school districts providing services to handicapped children. The services provided may be those of a special class, an itinerant teacher, or a resource room program. Chapter 241 also provides special services aid for large city school districts for educational services to the most severely handicapped, including the deaf. Also, as you may know, there has been legislation enacted which will provide handicapped children in non-public schools with health and welfare services from the public school. These services include speech and hearing therapy for hearing impaired children. Public school districts are responding and developing programs and services for the severely handicapped child. In the future these programs will continue to develop and expand.

CED standards address the problems faced by residential schools for the deaf, but I am not sure that when these standards were developed they recognized fully the developing educational alternatives which hearing impaired children are being offered outside of the special school, whether residential or day. We do have the more severely hearing handicapped child being educated in special classes, in resource rooms, in itinerant

teacher programs or receiving tutoring services in public school districts, including local districts, big city school districts, and regional educational agencies like BOCES. Under the recently enacted "Baby Bill" preschool deaf infants ages 0 - 3, will receive educational services with state aid, in agency or clinic programs and in public schools, as well as in special schools for the deaf. Cooperative programs between residential schools and public school districts are being developed. All of these optional programs and opportunities for the hearing impaired demand different competencies on the part of teachers of the hearing impaired. No longer can the teacher preparation institutions be concerned only with a single practicum center located in a special residential school if that teacher training institution is concerned with developing competencies for teachers of the hearing impaired, many of whom work in settings other than in a special residential school. The competencies needed may be the same in some areas but are different in other areas. It will be through consortia discussion which involves both special and public school personnel that this issue will be recognized, discussed, and resolved.

Topics of this Conference

What then are some of the considerations which must be made regarding competency based teacher education at this conference? First, it must be recognized that there is need for the development of consortia. Consortia should involve colleges and universities, employing school administrators, and representatives of the teachers. These teachers are not to be chosen by the administrators of the schools but rather teachers representing teacher opinion. In the public school sector it must be remembered that the

teachers associations or unions will wish to be represented within the consortia as expressing teacher opinion. They will resist the appointment of teachers by administrators. The consortia should represent collaborative efforts and shared decision making. The seat of wisdom is not vested solely in the college, nor in the administrator, nor in the teacher but hopefully will result from the cooperative efforts of all of these groups working together. It is hoped that this workshop will be a beginning towards recognition of this mandate and that the beginning steps to developing the consortia will take place.

Another outcome which we hope will result from this workshop is the recognition that there are a number of instructional options being made available to the hearing impaired children in New York State. The special school has long held its place in the spectrum of services available. However, it is not the sole resource. There are developing alternatives which include not only special classes in public school or BOCES but also itinerant teacher or resource room programs wherein essential supportive services are provided to hearing impaired children in regular classes. These instructional alternatives will be effective for certain hearing impaired children only if well qualified and competent teachers provide instruction. The competencies needed will be quite different from the competencies needed by teachers in special schools. Therefore, it is strongly urged that the colleges and universities which plan to submit programs for State approval include public school personnel in their consortia. Further it is suggested that public school settings be included as part of the practicum experience provided to teacher trainees in the college programs.

The population receiving instruction in the special schools for the deaf, as we all know, has changed over the years. We now find the most severely handicapped pre-lingually deaf child in the special schools. Many deaf children have multiple handicaps. The competencies needed by the teachers of the deaf in the special schools are quite different from the competencies needed by teachers not too many years ago. No longer can the teacher of the deaf complete a general preparation program and hope to be considered qualified to teach any deaf child anywhere, even in a special school for the deaf. The CED standards recognize the need for differentiated training, particularly within special school settings. The special school for the deaf does have outreach programs such as the occupational education cooperative programs with BOCES in five schools for the deaf in this State (Hehir, 1973). The teachers participating in this program need special competencies which may not be needed by other teachers in the special school. These would include competencies in working with occupational education teachers in the public school. It certainly would involve a knowledge of the curriculum of the public school and the adaptations necessary for the deaf students in the cooperative program.

These factors are relative to the selection process which necessarily must be involved when candidates for the teacher training programs are being considered. The pre-service preparation of these candidates must be considered in relation to the role and expectancies of the trainees in the special school. Therefore, liberal arts as opposed to speech and hearing background may be more desirable, or perhaps, community college preparation in occupational education skill areas is more desirable than another kind of preparation. Competencies in interpersonal and group

activities must be considered for teachers of the deaf who may be required to function with non-teachers of the deaf regarding curriculum modification and changes. If deaf children in a special school are to be mainstreamed into public school programs, the competencies of the teachers involved in this process are quite different from the competencies of a teacher of a self-contained class in a special school for the deaf. Some schools for the deaf are attempting to mainstream children as soon as possible and the competencies of the teachers involved are critical to the success of this project.

On the other hand, we have teachers of the deaf employed in public school programs. We also have teachers of the speech and hearing handicapped employed in public school programs. Both categories of teachers may be serving the hearing handicapped child. Certainly the competencies of these two classes of teachers should be different. Quite frequently the teacher of the speech and hearing handicapped has been chosen because she has had some experience in hearing and no other teacher competent in teaching the hearing impaired child is available. But does the speech and hearing teacher have the competencies necessary for the instruction of hearing impaired children? Does the teacher of the deaf have the competencies necessary to offer an adequate service in the public school? If a hearing impaired child is to be successful in a public school program, the teacher should be trained and have competencies related to the educational needs of the child in the environment in which she is employed. We question whether some teacher training programs closely affiliated with one residential school can adequately prepare a competent teacher to work in a public school program, which is of the resource room or itinerant

teacher type. Some teachers trained in this way have been successful in public school but could they be more competent if their teacher preparation program had been different? We hope that the public school teachers present at this conference might address this question.

In the public school the teacher of the hearing impaired will need to be more knowledgeable about the curriculum of the regular class. She will have to be capable of discussing with regular classroom teachers the educational needs of the hearing impaired child and the curriculum adaptations which will be necessary. Some teachers of the hearing impaired may need to function in team teaching settings with regular class teachers. Some teachers of the hearing impaired, even teaching a special class in the public school, will find that their students are not homogeneously grouped, and will need to alter their instruction accordingly. All of these circumstances demand good screening of student undergraduate training and good pre-service specialist training in order for the teacher to be successful. The question is: Are the teacher preparation programs presently in existence, or those which will be developed under a competency based, field centered approach, cognizant of these situations? Will programs prepare teachers to be more competent to work in these sometimes very difficult situations?

Considerations for Colleges and Universities

Some of the considerations more directly related to the colleges and universities include the following: CED is proposing areas of specialization at the pre-primary, elementary, secondary, multi-handicapped, and special content area. Will all five or six of the institutions of higher

education in New York State prepare on all levels? Is this necessary? Will certain colleges prepare teachers in certain areas of specialization while others concentrate on other areas of specialization? Is there a need for coordinated planning among the colleges and universities to resolve this question?

We recognize that this is the first time that all of the colleges and universities preparing teachers of the deaf have been brought together in New York State to discuss these problems. We suggest that this workshop is a beginning towards recognizing needs and, hopefully, toward some cooperative sharing, if not actual planning.

Some of the points we are raising are difficult to answer since they involve not just the willingness to cooperate but also very real intra-institutional decisions. What will happen to a student who may transfer from one university to another before completion of an approved program. Will the transfer student be able to achieve certification by the receiving college or university without repeating all of the previous training taken at the first university? Can there be a recognition of competency already achieved in an undergraduate program without taking graduate training? Will one university recognize the training provided by another university? We hope that such cooperative arrangements can be worked out.

Evaluation is an area that is always a sensitive one. A competency based teacher education proposal submitted by a university must contain an evaluation component. The role of the university in relation to the employing school and teacher group in evaluation must be determined cooperatively. Assessment, whose techniques, conditions, and standards are explicit and are made public and which strive for the greatest possible

objectivity and reliability, must be an integral part of the proposed program. The emphasis is on demonstrated competencies and, therefore, pre-instruction assessment which enables the student to demonstrate one or more competencies prior to undergoing instruction as well as after instruction, must be provided for. The consortia must define the evaluation process through mutual agreement.

The university preparing teachers of the hearing impaired who may be employed in a variety of settings will need to provide its teacher-trainees with practicum experiences in a number of settings if the teacher is to be competent for the variety of positions for which she may be employed. It appears that the employment opportunities are becoming more available in the public sector with the tenure of the faculty of the special schools becoming more stable. It does not seem desirable for a college or university to use only one practicum setting to the exclusion of those practicum centers where the teachers will more probably find employment.

Another sensitive area, of course, is methodology of communication. Although we certainly do not wish to advocate one methodology as opposed to another, we would raise this question: When a teacher training institution is preparing teachers, what competencies are necessary in methodology for the employment opportunities which are available? We raise this as a question which should be addressed in a discussion which generates light and not heat.

Teacher Competency Only

Competency based teacher education does not relate solely to the classroom teacher. "Teacher" is used here in a broad sense and includes all qualified school personnel. Does CED address itself to this point?

The State requirements for supervisor or administrator in special education and school district administrator generally, will need to be included in a competency based, field centered program offered by a university which prepares such personnel. This point is mentioned since it is one that appears to be overlooked, when one looks at the educational programs offered in the field of preparation of personnel for the deaf. Inservice education for practicing administrators and supervisors will be needed when student teachers are prepared on a competency base.

Another point which is frequently overlooked is the consumer of education -- in this case, the deaf students or deaf adults. Will they be involved as we explore the competencies needed by teachers of the deaf? The consortia may include parents, college students, and the consumer as well as the mandated participation of the college, the employing school administrator, and the teacher representatives.

This workshop should be viewed as a beginning step. Hopefully you are exposed to the need for developing a plan of action which will culminate in the submission of a program proposal in February of 1975 which will be competency based and field centered and which will involve all of the collaborative efforts of those groups represented at this conference. The task is clear, but the solution will be difficult to arrive at and will involve a long process. It will be achieved, however, when those of us here are willing to devote the time and effort necessary. The result, however, should be improved educational programs for the deaf children whom all of us are serving.

REFERENCES

Abeson, Alan. "Movement and momentum: government and the education of handicapped children." Exceptional Children, 1972, 39, 63-67.

Council on Education of the Deaf. Standards for the Certification of Teachers of the Hearing Impaired. Washington, D.C.: CED, January, 1972.

Education Beyond High School: The Regents Tentative Statewide Plan for the Development of Post Secondary Education. Albany, New York: The State Education Department, 1972.

Hehir, Richard G. "Integrating deaf students for career education." Exceptional Children, 1973, 39, 611-618.

New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education. Albany, New York: The State Education Department, October, 1972.

Preparation of Teachers of the Deaf, Report of a National Conference, U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin No. 8, 1966.

The Education of Children with Handicapping Conditions. A statement of policy and proposed action by the Regents of the University of the State of New York. Albany, New York: The State Education Department, November, 1973.

# PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION; THE UNIVERSITY PERSPECTIVE

Ann M. Mulholland, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

The title of this talk, determined some weeks past, is Performance Based Teacher Education, the University Perspective. It reminds me a little bit of my position in 1959 when I was in Wiesbaden at the World Congress of the Deaf seated at a table, almost as long as this, behind a little American flag, the sole American educator present. Colleagues from Yugoslavia, from Russia, from Holland, all these individuals with their delightful accents and through interpreters saying, "And what does the United States say?" The United States at that point didn't even know that I was there and what I said could be only that which I considered to be representative of our position in the United States.

The same obtains today. I shall present to you some of the very real questions which we at the university or college level are raising. While I find that our good friend, Dr. Hehir, has raised many of the issues which we have been concerned with, I think he has perhaps avoided two that we consider crucial.

The systems approach, modularization, entry behavior, control, task analysis, interface, support sub-systems, linkage, terminal behavior, accountability, a strange repertoire to describe teacher education in the seventies. It is the last word, accountability, which is the key to educational reform in this country. Dissatisfied with the extent to which the

schools have provided adequate education for all segments of the population, teacher educators, researchers, technologists, and theorists have adopted what is essentially an OBM approach, a budget management kind of approach, a business management approach, if you will, to education in response to demands for cost effective schooling, cost effective education.

Contrary to what some educators, practitioners, and administrators might like to think, performance based teacher education did not spring full blown from the head of - who was it? Medusa? It evolved as a result of many forces. (Rosner and Kay, p. 290) Realistically, taxpayers, Congressmen, state legislators, and city councilors have been demanding an accounting of funds spent on education, and rightly so, I think. Accountability. What is the return on the dollar spent? It may well be that emphasis on accountability triggered off CBTE. Relevance. That's really an out word at the college and university level today, but college students once protested that the relevance of course content to the real world was particularly important and so glibly applied it to every phase of life: educational, social, vocational, and even religion. Relevance is a critical word in terms of PBTE.

I suspect that to what I have just mentioned should be added the tremendous advances in educational technology which have markedly influenced the CBTE or PBTE movement. The proponents of competency based teacher education suggest that it is not an end in itself but a process leading ultimately to a more clearly defined and articulated teacher preparation program. This may well be. None of us believes, however, that competence based teacher education is

the only way to determine cost effectiveness of education. It is one way. And for better or worse, it is here. And especially now since we in New York are subjected to the mandate of the new competence based teacher education and certification. I think New York and Texas are the only two states that have mandated this kind of preparaton and credentialing.

How, then, does competence based teacher education affect the university? What are some of the issues? What is involved in credentialing on the basis of demonstrated competency? My first concern is the rate at which CBTE has been initiated, without, I believe, 1) adequate time for a precise definition of competence based teacher education; 2) without a determination of the level of specificity of the parts, if you will; and 3) without adequate time for the incorporation of the analytical and research component which is implied in competence based teacher education. I'll just state it differently. If we are to operationalize - isn't that a good business word - operationalize CBTE programs, the following must occur:

1) The tentative competencies must be identified. And I think appropriately in conjunction with those who are the consumers, those who are the employers, and those who represent the teachers.
2) We must assess the systems we develop. And I think that's one of our major problems.
3) Instructional materials must be prepared, and
4) Management systems must be devised to monitor the flow of students through the program. (Rosner and Kay, p. 294)

Why? Because we are saying that in a proper competence based teacher education program, the student proceeds at his own pace. How we are going to effect this

individualization none of us knows, but we hope that you will be directing your attention today to some of these concerns which we raise. The plan for management design and the funding of the research effort that is necessary to evaluate competency based teacher education as it develops are basic in the operationalization of competence based teacher education.

We should like to look for just a minute now at emphasis on competencies. How are we going to determine needed competencies? There are a number of us who responded to the appeal of the U.S. Office of Education several years ago to provide competence based programs. A number of us have already, through consultation with school personnel, with administrators and with teachers, developed for better or for worse those competencies which were tentatively designated and which probably are still in operation and which can now serve as a base for proper delineation under the consortia concept. So that does not constitute a problem. But what is a problem is what we encountered last week in consulting with a univeristy which was anticipating opening a teacher preparation program in education of the deaf. In all honesty one had to state that the so-called competencies of the program were simply a patchwork of competencies culled from a variety of programs and joined together with no specificity of what is needed as a teacher of the deaf. There was a philosophy stated but it was minimal. There was no basic philosophy re: education of the deaf per se. And that is one of our very real problems. What we're saying is that you can develop beautiful lists of competencies that have no relevance to the hearing-impaired individual child, youth, or later adult. And I think just because the state of New York will be monitoring our competencies as we submit

them in the proposal or program in February, we must not rush into preparing a list of competencies prematurely. It is our hope that today, during this conference, some guidelines will evolve as to the nature of these competencies. We must have a conceptual framework from which these competencies develop. We must have a conceptualizaton of the deaf person, the child, the adult. We must incorporate our knowledge of learning. We must, in my judgment, incorporate our philosophy of man and how he learns, the nature of man and how he learns, as well as a stated position regarding the schools of psychological thought which emanate from these various philosophical positions, and finally, the psychological school, whose research efforts, whose approach to learning we support. Without these basic assumptions, without a stated philosophy, if you would like an old-fashioned term, we cannot possibly develop an appropriate teacher-preparation program. (Houston, p. 7) We must look at available research. We have some information on competency based teacher education as it applies to normally-functioning children. I don't know very much research available in special education of competency based teacher education and its effects. We must incorporate the demands of specific curricula and goals. And here we have to incorporate not only the levels of the CED standards but also the educational settings in which graduates will teach which are vital. We must incorporate the experience of the profession, and we must develop those assessment strategies and measurement techniques in order to develop very basic information relative to teacher-preparation.

Assume then that the univeristy accepts the New York State mandate - I don't know what happens if a university doesn't - and moves to competency based teacher education for teachers of the deaf. What are some of the problems

that we face? Well, right there, the mandate alone constitutes a problem, especially the mandated consortium. First of all, who will coordinate the activity? Who will manage the articulation of public and private school personnel, of university staff, in the determination of competencies, in the determination of the design for the management system and the evaluation and assessment systems? Who are, and who will be responsible? Who will coordinate? That's a very realistic question. If you examine the New York programs preparing teachers of the deaf, the number of full-time staff involved is frightiningly limited. We're talking about St. Mary's, we're talking about Hunter, we're talking about Geneseeo. Let's be realistic. There are 24 hours in a day. There are X number of courses which must be taught. There are X number of students who must be supervised. We're already into the next academic year, at least some of us are. And who is going to perform these critical functions? Many of us are already working more than even our peers at the university and college prefer to see a faculty person working.

Will the State fund the replacement of a staff person to initiate CBTE and to help write the proposal or probably to write the proposal by February of 1975? Who minds the store? How are we going to individualize programs? If modularization is an objective and realistically, I see this as our only hope in education of the deaf, while the end product is likely to be provocative and stimulating, who will do it? Who is going to do the nitty-gritty of laying out the programs? Sure, we do have some things already in evidence such as was developed under the International Education of the Hearing-Impaired, that whole series of films has a very important place in this kind of modularization. But

none of it constitutes a module. Who is going to do it? Can we get the doctoral students to sit down and to develop the modules? Can we have them - yes, they can write the competencies. I'm sure of that. That's no problem. But who is going to do all of this while we are currently engaged in the proper management of a teacher-preparation program? Who is going to do this when universities are being told there will be cutbacks in tenure, there will be cutbacks in staff, no new instructors appointed. There will be cutbacks in funding for replacements even for those people on leave. We stated the situation publicly at one of our meetings when someone indicated that perhaps we'd have to cutback a little bit, teach more. And I laughed because I thought how can I teach any more than I'm now teaching. My friend across the table said, "All you have to do is just work a little harder." So like Avis we're trying, but I'm not so sure we're going to make it. We look to the State Education Department for some help to resolve the problems of staff time.

We have to face it. Education of the deaf, or the hearing-impaired as we prefer to refer to it, is a small highly-specialized field. We are not going to be able to say to someone in other areas of special education or to someone in psychology or sociology or in curriculum, "Look I'm overloaded. I need to have someone to teach a course in, for example, psychology of deafness. I need someone to teach a course in how to teach reading to deaf children, never laid eyes on a deaf child, but all right, we'll have them come in." It's ridiculous. We can't do it. As a matter of fact, those in general education think they can do it. A colleague said the other day that in three years he could teach a specific course as well as I. But meanwhile this person would

be teaching for three years. What happens to those 75 or more students going through the program during those years? Is that what's going to be happening?

My directive then to you is, I charge you participants, with evolving a creative solution to this very real problem of who is going to design the CBTE programs in the universities when staff are already overworked.

A second problem that I see is the selection process of students. What are the criteria that we are going to be using to meet the needs of the field? How shall we select students? Are we simply going to say we will educate them for stated levels and for specific educational settings without any regard for need? Those of you who are superintendents of schools know that I sent out a very brief little paper requesting some information. And it's rather interesting to see how we lack the data upon which to base predictions. I asked if we could predict the needs of the schools in New York State in 1980 and 1985. We asked what the attrition rate was of staff. We asked what the current staff was, what the pupils were, etc. and we have information on 421 staff members, exclusive of all the specialists like audiologists, media, etc. Of this number there are 82 in pre-school, 216 in elementary, 90 in secondary, and 33 in the multihandicapped. We asked how many pupils there were and their ages, considering an interface here with CED. Zero to three, there are 236 now, three to five years - 501, six to ten and they're still the Rubella group, over 1,000, eleven to sixteen - 675, and the sixteen or years over - 221. Granted that this was a relatively selective sample because it represented those programs, with the exception

of the public school programs, which are represented at this conference. But it just is a feeling for what is going to happen.

What is the attrition rate of teachers? It varies from zero to 20%. And this is a very basic need stated. How many teachers will be needed next year? How many teachers are you going to need in a few years? Because we're coming back to what? The economical efficiency of the program preparing teachers of the deaf. What is the most urgent need? It was unanimously the multi-handicapped. And there were some interesting comments relative to the need for resource room and itinerant teachers.

We urge you then to look at the university which is already having problems in saying we will now write a proposal for 1975, February, but we are not too sure yet because there isn't enough data to act upon. We don't know how many teachers and at what level we should be preparing. A concern of the university has to be the real one of funding. How can we fund the consortia members? How can we fund and guarantee proper quality education of the school child while the representatives are involved in many, many time-consuming discussions and meetings. At the present time we have a varied pattern in funding master teachers. Again this takes a great deal of time from the school. How are we going to fund the total process of CBTE? How are we going to finance new materials, modularization? I would suspect that many of you could be highly creative in providing new approaches to financing and in the selection of priorities if there is this commitment to CBTE.

Our fourth problem at the university level is one of evaluation. Who will evaluate the competencies of each teacher? Will we operate so that the student will receive a master's degree and have no credentials if the student

does not attain the degree of competence which we consider to be appropriate. A major question and one which I would hope this group would consider very carefully is briefly: Is practicum the place where competency is demonstrated? If we say that the practicum situation, the student teaching experience, is where competency is demonstrated, then we have a very different operation from one that assumes that demonstrated competence comes within year one post-graduation, year two, ot year three. Who will, if we follow this latter concept, finance that which is essential in an evaluating process if the university is responsible for credentialing? Who will finance the cost of supervising and evaluating graduates over a period of time?

I suggest that we look very closely at the whole process of evaluation. Evaluation in some college programs is already on the basis of competence. But most of us are not satisfied with the format and the materials which we have developed. How are we going to evaluate? How are we going to prove? How are we going to assess "demonstrated competence?" It's a very real problem.

The next problem that I foresee is that of in-service training. The State presumably will grandfather in all those who are already certified as teachers of the deaf or the hearing-impaired regardless of the competencies which they exhibit. And as I see the state program, there is no provision for requiring the updating of competency which may, of course, be stimulated by the school leadership.

The last problem which I see is the major one from the university position; that is, the governance of teacher education programs. I think we define governance as determining the policy to govern whatever the action

is that we undertake. And we are talking about a mandated consortia which will be involved in the governance of teacher education programs through a board where there is equal participation but differentiation in management responsibilities. The question remains, however, what effect will such governance have on university policy. What effect will it have on higher education in general? I believe in one state on the West Coast teaching preparation requires no higher education involvement at all. So it sounds in some instances as if there is a possibility of going back a hundred years in teacher education.

In terms of governance then, what organizational structures will have to be modified? How can we affect such changes? We know that courses plus points do not equal knowledge, do not equal necessarily competency. But how are we going to change the university structure which again takes time? How are we going to relate to the specialization of the faculty and the specialization interests of the faculty? How do we insure the proper freedom to seek the truth which is the bulwark of the university? How do we guarantee the academic freedom intrinsic to our society? If we emasculate the university, what effect will such action have on our nation, on our society?

I look forward to the discussions that you will be having. I'm looking specifically for an expression of creativity. We've been wrestling with these problems for many months. We are looking to you for some guidelines for the resolution of the problems which face us at the university and at the school level.

## References

Gilmore, Joseph. Competency based teacher education. The Forum, Winter 1973, 46.

Houston, Robert, W., Dodle, N. & Webster, W. Competency-Based Teacher Education Program Design: A Simulation. Westfield, Texas: Competency-Bsed Instructional System, 1973.

Rosner, Benjamin & Kay, Patricia, M. Will the promise of C/PBTE be fulfilled? Phi Delta Kappan, January 1974. 290-296.

# PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF TEACHERS:

# A SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR'S POINT OF VIEW

Ralph L. Hoag, Ed.D.
Rochester School for the Deaf

## Introduction

The group that is assembled in this room was called to meet for the next three days to review and discuss performance-based teacher education and its implications for each of us in the education of hearing-impaired children and youth.

This group, I am sure, does not need the admonition to avoid discussion that one educational setting is better or worse than another. We certainly don't need to debate that this method is better or worse than another. All of us with our individual talents and skills are needed in this work. Our varying philosophies have purpose and a place for the education of children in whatever setting or wherever they are. The effectiveness of a program has always depended primarily upon the talent of creative teachers.

We are here to find ways to help talented young people become really creative teachers, teachers that are needed in our schools.

I do not have a plan that would tell you how to do this. You are the ones who have been asked to do it. In the formulation of this group, you represent some of the best talent in this state. Represented are people from all types of educational settings. Collectively, you should be able to work out a program that will help each institution of higher education prepare stronger, better equipped teachers for our schools.

Carbon copy programs, I am sure, are not what you want to make. Each program in the state has its special strengths, interests and resources. These should be utilized to make good programs become better ones.

## Where We Have Been

I find it difficult to talk about today's needs in teacher education without looking back and reflecting on where we have been.

The need for a systematic process for preparing new teachers has been evident throughout the history of the education of the deaf in the U.S. The earliest formal programs designed to prepare people for our field, other than their own schools, began before the turn of the 20th Century. These were primarily in-service training programs established and managed by teachers and educators. These include many of the great names we still quote and read about today. Most schools trained teachers on an in-service basis. Somd did more than others and supplied the needs of schools besides their own. The earliest among these were: Clarke 1889, Gallaudet 1891, Wisconsin 1913, St. Mary's 1914, Central Institute 1914.[1]

Great names in our history played significant roles in these programs and set the standards in their writings and publications for programs that followed. Some of these were Yale; Croker, Jones, and Pratt; Fitzgerald; Stevenson; Quinn; Goldstein; and many others who have passed on. These ranks were filled by others equally as great but too numerous to name here.

---

[1] Founding dates from American Annals of the Deaf, Vol. 119, No. 2, April, 1974.

The foundations of the programs they had was in the classroom. All of the leadership then were master teachers and were unquestionably the models for young student teachers.

In 1930, the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf and the Alexander Graham Bell Association established minimum standards to help develop what appeared to them at the time to be a reasonable program for preparing teachers. A certification program grew out of this and was administered by the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf. A process for the review and approval of programs followed soon afterwards.

During the period following the 30'2, a steadily increasing number of colleges and universities were asked to assist and to add the dignity of academia by endorsing their programs. Giving academic credit for the work that was done became an essential ingredient for students of that period.

The period of 1930 to 1960 was one of no subsidy, work for room and board, and slave labor for each one to fulfill his or her ambitions for service in this field. It was a dignified and worthwhile profession then as it is today. However, the need and demands for more people in our field soon far exceeded the supply. Economics soon made it impossible to meet the demand.

## Impact of Federal Legislation

Federal legislation of 1960-63 changed all this and the period which followed. The educational needs of children changed as quickly as the population increased, and programs were forced to reevaluate the older strategies and to look for newer approaches.

Prior to Federal legislation, less than 300 teachers completed programs each year. Each year 1,000 or more are prepared as teachers in our programs and have been during the past six to eight years.

The sheer bigness of the problem as it grew an- multiplied forced us into a reassessment of our programs. We are still in this phase of development.

Subsidization increased the number of programs. School-managed programs became college and university programs. Lack of qualified leadership brought about the checker game of talent in the 60's. Many colleges and universities became insensitive to the schools and the people who were used for practicum support. As personnel moved about, the quality of programs suffered greatly in the process. We are now slowly but steadily coming back.

## Turning Point for Program Up-Date

The Virginia Beach Conference in 1964 was a turning point when the growing problem was looked at by those who attended that conference. It was looked at by the most diversified and representative group that had ever been brought together in our field in its history, such as we are doing here at this conference. I see only one missing ingredient here at this conference and that is representation of The Consumer.

We are here to look at one part of the program for preparing teachers. Many of us would say "the most important part." The activity that puts our theories and knowledge to practice. Performance of the teacher in the classroom.

Virginia Beach helped us to bring about a broadening of the base for teacher education in our field. Later, under the pressure of a

unified group broadly representative of all elements and special interests in our field, the CEASD turned over its activities to the Council on Education of the Deaf. A note, however, the Conference of Executives did an outstanding job and did it when we needed this kind of leadership action. They graciously passed their activities on to the CED in 1969 when the evidence was clear that the Council was equipped and capable of carrying on the work that they had started.

## A Look to the Future

Revision of the certification program was first to come out of this new sponsorship. The evaluation of the process for the reevaluation of programs is currently under way. It is believed that we are now beginning to realize that the respective roles of and the relationship between our institutions of higher education and our schools need to be brought back into balance, that it once again becomes a real working partnership.

Together here during these three days, we should accomplish this for New York State. We should look very carefully at both the weaknesses and strengths of our current partnership. We should be able to rediscover the fact that we all need each other.

Great teachers are in our schools, and they are equally as dedicated and talented as those we've known in the past. They need recognition and, most of all, deserve the dignity of respect for the important role they play.

# THE ROLE OF THE STATE IN COMPETENCY BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

Charles C. Mackey, Jr., Ed.D.
Associate Teacher Certification
Division of Teacher Education and Certification
New York State Education Department

I do believe that much of the steam is now out of my address, but since I did prepare a few remarks, I will share them with you. Perhaps when I am finished, I will have told you more than you want to know. Perhaps I won't have told you all you want to know. I'm certain, however, that I will not have addressed all the area Dick (Hehir) mentioned. We did attempt last week to clarify our roles and identify issues that should be addressed, and, hopefully, I will get to them.

For many years I've had a strong desire to build a grandfather's clock. As you may know, there is a magazine called Yankee that many New Englanders subscribe to because they don't want to forget where they came from. The magazine carries an ad, I believe monthly, through which one may order parts for a grandfather's clock. Well, I finally sat down and ordered that kit and am attempting to put the clock together. It struck me as I was working on it that there may be some similarities between a grandfather's clock and a State Education representative.

Consider--both are about six feet tall, both have a tendency to be somewhat ponderous, both are more traditional than functional, both provide noisy communication of essentially commonplace information. . .

I will leave it to each of you to decide at the end of this session how apt the similarity is.

When Frances Cronin gave me a copy of the program about a week and a half ago, she didn't really give me an opportunity to identify what I wanted to speak on, but the title is there, "Competency Based Teacher Education". In musing over a topic as broad as that, I was struck by the words of the Commissioner of Education, Joe Nyquist, who said that trying to define competency based teacher education is like trying to peel an onion. "You peel off one layer after the other until you wind up with nothing except maybe a few tears". Well, since it is such a broad topic, I decided that maybe I should talk about the role of the State in competency based teacher education.

## The Transitional Stage

In New York State, we are moving from a conventional system of teacher education certification to one that we term competence based teacher education and certification. And, as Dr. Nyquist so aptly stated, it is a very difficult term to identify. There are some 12 to 15 other states in the Union that are moving toward a competency based teacher education and certification system and not one parallels the other. Each has its own definition of what a competency based program is and what the resultant certification system will be like. During this session, I will attempt to tell you what we in New York mean by a competency based teacher education system.

We consider teacher education to be competency based if:

1) the knowledge, skills and attitudes to be demonstrated by the teacher candidate are explicitly and publicly stated as are their accompanying evaluative measures;

2) the assessment of the teacher candidate's competence uses his performance as the primary source of evidence;

3) the candidate's rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competence; and

4) the program facilitates the acquisition of those competencies.

What this shift means philosophically is that we are no longer making the assumption that certain characteristics of preparation necessarily produce corresponding characteristics of performance. Clearly this approach focuses attention on performance and presents problems with evaluation. Before addressing myself to the complex and necessarily sensitive question of evaluation, let me review current certification requirements. These current requirements I like to refer to as the "multiple of three syndrome". And let me advise you that, while we are currently being criticized for lack of research, the research that we have done in the past appears to have been based on multiples of three.

For example, a baccalaureate degree, commonly 120 semester hours, a multiple of three. A fifth year of preparation, the equivalent of a Master's degree, 30 semester hours of graduate study, a multiple of three. For administrative or supervisory certification, 60 semester hours of graduate study, a multiple of three. 12 semester hours in professional education for secondary academic teachers, 24 semester hours in professional education for elementary teachers, 36 semester hours in English content for the English teacher, 18 hours in a foreign language for a foreign language teacher, 24 semester hours in mathematics for a mathematics teacher, etc. And you know it applies to special education as well as I do.

In 1936, the mandatory requirement of a baccalaureate degree for elementary school teachers, special subject teachers, and teachers of academic subjects was established. Routinely, we think of New York State as the Empire State, the State that has everything. Being a non-New Yorker, I like occasionally to dispute that statement because New York was not in the vanguard of states mandating a baccalaureate degree for certification. There were little states like Rhode Island that established baccalaureate degrees as minimum requirements for teachers much earlier in that decade. In 1943, the fifth year requirement was enacted for teachers of academic and special subjects. And in 1963, the requirement of a fifth year of preparation was added for elementary teachers as well.

For many years, the State Education Department has evaluated and approved teacher education and other collegiate programs by weighing at the institutional level the same kinds of things which we were requiring at the individual level for teacher certification. That is to say, we looked at the training and experience of the staff. We looked at the size of the institution and at the physical plant. We counted the number of volumes in the library and the appropriateness of the curriculum. Now you know as well as I do that those hallmarks can guarantee us a qualified and competent teacher!

We have come to realize that in some cases the desired effect of meeting the needs of the schools is not achieved by a system which is based upon preparation without considerable concern for actual performance in a particular context. Having committed ourselves to meet the needs of the schools by offering a competency based program, some significant questions immediately appear.

First, many questions involving value judgments arise in regard to establishing models. What are the necessary and desirable characteristics for someone who will work as the principal instructional person in the classroom? as a staff member providing personnel services? or as a person serving in a leadership role? What kind of work performance, behaviors,or criteria will be expected of this person? What are the goals which the school has set and which it wishes accomplished. Are those objectives stated in a way that one can determine when and how well they are being achieved? These questions are augmented by others regarding how these objectives are to be achieved and measured, what knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors on the part of the staff member are necessary to accomplish these objectives. To what extent is the success of the teacher's performance judged by the outcome on the part of the students; that is, for example, increases in grade levels? What other factors will be taken as evidence of success attributable to the teacher? What changes in attitudes, values and feelings will be given credit? If it is true that what the teacher <u>is</u> may be more important that what the teacher <u>does</u>, what characteristics of <u>being</u> will be required for persons working in the State's classrooms?

Another important series of problems is related to how underdeveloped capabilities, capacities, skills, and understandings are to be strengthened and enlarged. Clearly in all of these areas of concern, some of the elements can be measured by formal testing or verified by attendance in college courses. For example, we can reasonably expect a teacher of history or of mathematics or of art to know as much about his subject matter area as a cross section of college majors in that particular discipline.

Just so, the teacher should be familiar with the key educational opinions that can be used in his subject or grade, and this can be accomplished and checked in a straightforward traditional way. We have no complaints in that area. Because, however, there are other elements which, as some of the above questions indicate, cannot be as easily and conventionally produced and measured, our Board of Regents sanctioned 12 trial projects.

## Board of Regents Trial Projects

These trial projects, which are attempts at a performance based, field centered approach to teacher education and certification represented the culmination of five years of discussion, conceptualization, and broadened understanding. The projects involve professional staff and school representatives from the school district: faculty, students, community representatives, three in some,and members of professional associations. The trial projects represent various models ranging from a single school and one college department to six school districts and five colleges. They are distributed throughout the State, from New York City to the upper reaches of the Adirondacks,and from the Niagara frontier to the Island. They include certification areas such as English, science, counseling, administration, learning disabilities, industrial arts, and elementary education. During the past two years, the trial projects have illustrated some of the difficulties inherent in the process of converting a conventional teacher education program into one that is competency based.

I will discuss some of these difficulties as well as some interim rewards under three headings: governance, program development, and program management and evaluation.

Governance. The trial projects are based on the cooperation, indeed the equal partnership of several constituencies which have rarely functioned in congress before. The wedding of such disparate groups as the public school teachers, their collegiate brethren, community representatives, teachers in training and school administrators into one decision making and implementing body proved to be a considerable challenge. In the light of the many subtle and overt areas of disagreement and conflicting concerns that exist in such a group, it is not surprising that the policy boards of a few of the trial projects have taken a long time to develop governance regulations. Matters such as quorum and voting procedures become crucial to such a group. Time is required to establish a context in which issues can be discussed candidly and constructively. As happens in some groups, in a few cases the representatives of one agency have dominated the others in policy board meetings. Despite the inherent difficulties of group governance, however, we are encouraged by the fact that most of the policy boards have overcome these difficulties and have been able to establish by-laws and procedures for making complex decisions. What is more, they have found that there is much to be gained by pooling their ideas of what a teacher is, and should be, and of how the board can bring the candidate for certification closer to the model.

Several project participants have remarked on their discovery that the different constituencies can communicate and can profit by that communication which is in itself justification for the trial projects. Although the guidelines for the development of competence based programs, which will be applied to all teacher education before 1980, will not require full partnership of the different agencies, it is clear that to require significant and

functional involvement of teachers and administrators is both desirable and humanly possible. Having concluded this, we must move immediately to one of the most pressing problems of the governance aspect, the time-money dilemma.

Quite simply, in most cases the members of the policy making board have added their project responsibilities to a full time job. This has made frequent meetings an impossibility. Additionally there are expenses necessarily incurred for meetings, materials, travel, supplies, and consultive help which have not been available. Each project initially received $8,000 in each of the first two years of operation. Each will receive $1,500 for this fiscal year. Since the State is unable to provide greater financial assistance, the problems of the project have been further complicated by the time-money concerns. There is a footnote here I'd like to add regarding one of the trial projects operating in the State's southern tier: there, the teachers' association has allocated funds from the association's budget to continue the project. They are so involved in it and feel so assured by the progress made so far that they have committed their funds to keep the project moving.

As all the teacher education programs convert to a competence base, they will be expected to do so by reallocating their own resources rather than by the State totally underwriting their cost. One particularly encouraging development has been the ability of projects to obtain direct financial support from its member agencies, and in another instance where the project has made direct application to a foundation for support. In still another project, the school district itself is contributing money to the support of the project.

Program Development. Another area in which a number of problems have been identified is in the area of program development. In order to lay an appropriate foundation for the teacher preparation program, the trial projects were asked to describe the objectives and priorities of the participating school districts. The intent was that the school objectives, in terms of desired pupil outcomes, would suggest certain teacher skills or attitudes which in turn would necessitate certain teacher training activities. The most common situation, however, was that no such written objectives existed. It was unrealistic to expect the policy board to write a district's objectives and priorities for it or to wait until such a list was created by the school board or the superintendent. As a result, several projects were unable to establish this foundation, and in one case where it was furnished, the resultant teacher education program overemphasized the cognitive almost to the exclusion of the affective domain of behavior. The aforementioned guidelines with which all teacher preparation institutions will have to comply, do not require the school objectives to be described. Rather, it is desirable that the goals of the preparatory programs be derived from an examination of the roles and responsibilities of appropriate on-the-job professional personnel. In short, we have learned that a conceptualization of the teaching role is an important ingredient in competence based teacher education but may not be efficiently derived from school objectives per se. The process of developing a comprehensive picture of the role of the teacher, counselor, or administrator may serve to forestall the inclination to rely on old methods courses rather than to develop new instructional modules.

Another problem which has emerged from the program planning experience of the trial projects pertains to whether they should borrow or create new statements of competence with their accompanying instructional and assessment system. Most of the projects have decided that they would rather do it themselves, so to speak, a feeling that borrowing might stifle their originality and uniqueness. On the other hand, once into the creative process, many of the same projects have discovered the laboriousness of expressing clearly, for the entire scope of the preparatory program, what a graduate of the program should be able to do and be; how these skills and attitudes should be inculcated, and how their successful achievement should be measured. There is no single answer to this dilemma, especially now when little or no work has gone before it in some areas. It is apparent that many groups trying to create a competency based program will benefit from the others' efforts, and an important role for the Division of Teacher Education and Certification is to disseminate information about available resources. The trial projects were charged with describing not only the pedagogical competencies of their trainees but also their subject matter knoweldge; that is, for example, physics or English, as well as their general education. It was not sufficient for them to focus only on putting 18 or 24 credit hours of education course work in a competency framework.

Because of the perceived or presumed difficulty in obtaining the cooperation of liberal arts faculty in the colleges and because of the sheer magnitude of the task of the trial projects, these competencies have received minimal attention in most projects. Here again, the new guidelines for all teacher education programs reflect the original intent but in a modified

form. The college faculty and their public school counterparts must deal with the entire college program of the teacher but not with the same detail in the non-education elements.

Another problem that has manifested itself in program development by the trial projects is the enormous difficulty of designing assessment procedures to verify that each competence has been mastered. We have said that there must be full disclosure of the means, conditions, and criteria of assessment. The teacher and the learner must have a clear and common understanding of the base upon which demonstration of competence will be determined. This is the basic underpinning of the competence based program in New York, and it is probably the most difficult to design and to execute. This has been borne out by one trial project that was in full operation this past year. Many of the assessment statements generated by that group were quite subjective and unclear about the circumstances and standards for competence demonstration. Considerable confusion and frustration resulted. Certainly it is difficult, if not impossible, to measure attitudes objectively. Nonetheless it is incumbent on those responsible for making these judgments to state clearly, in advance, what the indicators of success are, subjective though they may be. The complexity of assessment underlies the earlier point that the Division must disseminate information about available materials, especially those that might serve as models of clarity and objectivity.

The third broad area of problems I wish to mention concerns the management and evaluation of competence based programs. Since only one of the trial projects has operational status, we lack an adequate sampling. Hence some problems may be overstated while others may be unanticipated. One

belief that is widely shared is that there must be someone who coordinates the program during its implementation. The single operational project attempted to use four coordinators, one in each of the two school districts and one in each of the two participating colleges. As a result, no one person was responsible for insuring that all the cooperating teachers and principals, college instructors, and supervisors knew and performed their roles and responsibilities: that there was reasonable uniformity in the two districts; that the overall in-service needs of the participating personnel were attended to, and that there was a smooth flow of policy and feedback between the policy makers and the program participants. That project's governing board has now hired a director with the cost being shared by the college and the districts.

Another set of problems confronts the people working in a project when they attempt to gain accommodations from some of the more entrenched portions of the higher education institutions. The very nature of a competence based program foretells trouble in a registrar's maze of credit hours, semesters, A's, B's, C's, D's, rigid transfer policies, and precise faculty time equations. How does one transpose instructional modules into credits for degree or transfer purposes, develop gradations of competence to fit grade categories, equate a professor's diagnostic and prescriptive activities with a normal course load when students undertake modules, and finally accommodate the student who acquires certain competencies in half the time or twice the time that is deemed normal? This represents another area where the Division can be of assistance by publicizing models of institutional reform or accommodation which can serve rather than impede competence based programs.

## The Transitional Plan

Interspersed in my comments about our experience with the trial projects were references to our plan for a transition by all teacher preparation institutions to a system of teacher education based upon demonstration of competence. I would like to describe this plan which has been adopted by the Board of Regents. The Regents have stated as their goal for the preparation of professional personnel in the schools "to establish a system of certification by which the State can assure the public that professional personnel in the schools possess and maintain the required skills, attitude, and knowledge to enable children to learn". The trial projects represent the beginning of the department's attempt to implement that goal. Beginning February 1, 1975, all new programs will be approved by the Department. And by 1980, all 1900+ teacher education programs must comply with the new guidelines if they wish to continue to have State approval.

Proposal Format. Let me now briefly review with you the format for the submission of teacher education program proposals which will be distributed to you and which you will have an opportunity to review this afternoon in some of your consortia and role-alike groups. As program developers will be preparing their proposals to address these guidelines, so will the State Education Department in the preliminary registration procedure need to make its judgment on the basis of these written proposals. The format asks for the following information.

1. the rationale and objectives of the proposed programs;

2. the nature of the agreement and involvement that exists among the colleges, the public school officials and the school teachers;

3. the entrance requirements of the program;

4. the specific skills, behaviors, knowledge, and attitudes which the program will provide instruction in, and for which it will hold candidates responsible;

5. the relationship between the competencies, that is, the skills, behaviors, attitudes, and knowledge in which the preparatory program provides instruction, and the roles and functions of appropriate on-the-job professionals;

6. the kinds of evidence that will be collected by the program to insure that the candidate completing the program and thereby recommended for certification has acquired the appropriate skills, behaviors, and knowledge; and

7. the procedures that the program has developed for engaging in program evaluation, feedback, and self-evaluation.

Review. In examining programs submitted for preliminary registration, the Department will obviously need to review proposals for completeness. It will need to examine the proposals to determine that:

1. There is a rationale and a set of objectives for the program.

2. There is agreement and involvement in the program development on the part of the college, the school district and the teachers. This is the collaborative effort which culminates in the formation of a consortium which we feel is critical to the success of a program.

3. The proposal includes the specific skills, behaviors, knowledge, and attitudes in which the program will provide instruction.

4. The attitudes, skills, knowledge, and behaviors are appropriate and comprehensive.

5. The entrance requirements, if any, are clear and the techniques for assessment are stated.

6. The assessment procedures are such that there will be assurance that the candidates recommended for certification have acquired the knowledge and demonstrated the achievement of skills and behavior.

7. An evaluation system has been designed which will allow for effective program feedback and enhance the chances for self correction.

Accreditation Criteria. Having stated the kinds of evidence that will be examined, we now come to the heart of the matter, that is, the problem of criteria. The Department can, of course, simply determine whether the aforementioned items are included in the proposal. That is, we can simply check to see whether the program has any rationale and that it does have a program evaluation system. Determining whether or not the proposal is complete is a fairly easy task and one that can be handled expeditiously. However, if we were to do only that, would we be carrying out our appropriate functions in the area of registration and certification? While the two, registration and certification, are of course different, they are in fact intertwined. When the Department registers a teacher education program, it is not only officially sanctioning and giving approval for a program to prepare teachers, it is also empowering the program to recommend graduates of that program for certification. Hence, not only does the Department have a direct responsibility to students enrolled in an officially approved teacher education program, but also to the public-at-large. The authority that the Department delegates to the program is that of determining whether or not individuals are worthy of receiving a teaching certificate. The question then arises as to whether an agency which is legally empowered to certify teachers can afford to have no specific criteria for the registration of teacher preparatory programs which upon being registered may recommend individuals for certification. It seems to me that the answer is obvious. The Department, if it is to be so responsible and to carry out its legal mandate, must then have accreditation criteria. Moreover, the Department has had these accreditation criteria in the past.

Program Evaluation. The process of program evaluation and revision is the key to long term accreditation of trial projects and all other teacher education programs in New York State. If a program has clearly delineated procedures and operations for ascertaining deficiencies in feeding that information back for adjustments, the Division will have readily observable data for its own decision-making processes. This process would logically encompass both internal evaluations with respect to the efficiency of various program components and research, including follow-up of graduates, in an effort to validate these components. One fundamental evaluation decision that exists for designers of competence based programs is whether and to what extent they should focus on the teacher-candidate's effect on pupil learning as distinguished from merely the ability to display a particular skill or attitude regardless of its practical effects. This decision is necessary both in terms of evaluating individuals in the program and in validating the program by evaluating graduates who are on the job. A handful of the trial projects have confined themselves to following the more difficult road of examining changes in pupil behavior for both trainees and program assessment. All teacher education programs in New York State will be encouraged and required to follow their lead. The trial project model is an incomplete one. Each project is working in a few certification areas at most. But the projects are an important and significant step in the development of a more complete teacher preparatory and certification system which will cover all the areas of certification and which will address preparation for entry into school service. In addition, it will provide for the maintenance of competence.

For example, it has had standards and made determinations about the adequacy of facilities, the qualifications of staff, the curricula pattern, the library holdings, and a number of input factors. Furthermore, these standards have been basically congruent with certification requirements. However, now that the Department has issued new guidelines for the submission of teacher preparatory programs and is asking for different kinds of information about programs, it has a responsibility for developing standards or criteria and for beginning to make judgments based on these standards. The Department is, therefore, presently engaged in developing criteria for accreditation which, while allowing for diversity and maximum flexibility on the part of the program developers, will enable it to examine programs on bases which are defensible and in keeping with its obligations.

Problems and Issues. What then are some of the issues and questions the Department is dealing with in relation to developing criteria for preliminary registration? Among the questions are the following: What constitutes an adequate rationale for a teacher preparatory program? Must the rationale provide a fairly precise conceptualization of the role of a beginning teacher or can the Department accept a rationale that is broad and general in nature? While the question of rationale may be seen by some as being somewhat minor in regard to the preparation of a teacher education program, it is for some a rather important question. Furthermore, how does an accrediting agency determine whether or not a program is internally consistent? What evidence should the Department accept that there has been significant and functional involvement and agreement among the three mandated agencies: college, school district, and the profession, and that they have agreed to implement the program as submitted?

Can, for example, the Department accept the signatures of the three parties as adequate evidence that the program has the approval of different agencies and that they are willing to assume responsibility for their portion of the program in its implementation phase? What constitutes a comprehensive program? What evidence is acceptable that the competencies have been derived from roles and responsibilities of the on-the-job professional? What evidence is acceptable that adequate assessment procedures have been developed? Specifically, are the assessments precise, accurate, and sensitive to nuances, and do they allow for the influence of the setting variables on performance as well as assess the instructional programs?

Finally, what evidence is acceptable that an adequate internal program of evaluation format has been designed? Not only will we need to examine whether or not the program evaluation design will be able to gather data to determine if the students are acquiring the competencies as effectively and as efficiently as possible, but we will also need to examine the design to ascertain whether it will enable the program personnel to gather evidence of the adequacy of the program.

## Conclusions

The preceding issues and questions are among the primary ones that personnel in the Division of Teacher Education and Certification are wrestling with as they attempt to delineate criteria for the preliminary registration of teacher preparatory programs. I am sure that all of you are aware of the difficulties that we confront as we establish these criteria. I suspect that initially our accreditation criteria for preliminary registration, like your efforts in developing competence based programs, will not be as sophisticated nor as precise as all of us would

like them to be. However, we do believe that as we acquire additional experience and expertise in competency based teacher education, the preparatory programs as well as the Department's criteria and judgments will reflect continued growth and maturity.

QUESTIONS TO THE PANELISTS

Q: Where is the money coming from to initiate P/CBTE?

Mackey: It's a question that we have not seen as an irrelevant one. I'm glad you raised it, because I am pleased to report that the Regents supported the request of the Division of Teacher Education and Certification for $430,000 for purposes of support of the move to a competence based teacher education and certification program in New York state.

Prior to this time, there has been precious little seed money available through the U.S. Office of Education and Title V grants to the State wherein we provided initially around $8,000 to some 15 trial projects that I'll speak to you about early in this afternoon's program. But now that money is fast disappearing. We felt it was time that the State assumed some responsibility for the Competency Based Teacher Education Programs inasmuch as it was through the membership of the Legislature that the State Education Department is under the mandate that it is. Last year they honored us with the grand total of $32,000 to help the State in its efforts to promote CBTE. This year they provided us with an equally grand amount. I guess it's a question of just having to keep repeating one's demands at the budget office and hopefully the sound will be heard. We are presently preparing a budget for the '75 - '76 fiscal year. We think we have made some inroads because the persons in the budget office who are responsible for approving the Education Department's budget have consented to go around the State and visit the trial projects that are presently in various phases of operation and also to visit some of the colleges and universities across the State that are beginning to implement CBTE

Interstate Certification Project. Certification is based upon the fact that a college's program is approved by the respective education agency in which it is located. So I think it does have both inter and intrastate repercussions if a college or university elected to participate in a program such as this.

Q: We all see the complexity of the task at hand, but it seems terribly unrealistic to do something meaningful within the time limits set. Is there any possibility that it can be extended?

Mackey: The timing was not really of our own choosing. For those of you who follow the legislative process, you may recall that two years ago Assemblywoman Constance Cook from the Ithica region of the state introduced legislation in the Assembly which was read three times and put on the floor wherein competency based teacher education would have been mandated totally across the state as of September 1, 1973. Fortunately, because we do have a fine staff of attorneys in the Department who are in constant contact with what happens educationally in the Legislature, we managed to get that bill bottled, put back into committee, and it died a glorious death there.

But the regents nonetheless were under pressure from the Legislature to take some bold steps in converting teacher education programs in New York State to one based on competence. Just prior to this time, and I guess what precipitated Constance Cook's legislation, was the fact that for the past five years we had been doing some research in the area of competency based teacher education by supporting some 13 trial projects across the state. And as a result of that, not by anything the Department published, but by just a simple awareness that these projects were going on, were being continued, and seemed

so that they will get a first hand knowledge of just what CBTE is about. It is our feeling they just don't understand how the new method of preparing teachers differs from the traditional method and why it's not just simply a reallocation of funds presently going to the public and private colleges, both as direct grants and to Bundy money. It just can't be reallocated to support CBTE. We don't see that as totally feasible and we see a need for some other funds to support CBTE.

Q: What would happen if the private colleges and universities of the State of New York were to say simply that they would not participate in this program, that they are national service agencies?

Mackey: By statute the State Education Department, the Commissioner of the Regents, and through the power which he has, he is required to approve all curricula offerings, degree programs in the colleges operating in New York State. The regulatory powers that the Commissioner of the Regents has is unlike anything that exists, I think in any of the other 49 jurisdictions. Now if a college or university does not wish to become part of a collaborative plan for preparing teachers under what we term a competency based teacher education program, then that means simply that the State Education Department would not approve that curricula offering and that graduates from those programs would not be eligible for certification in New York. And the national repercussions would be, then, in light of the interstate certification project, the potential is there that graduates of that program, since it is not state approved, would not be eligible for certification in some 26 other states as well since as of this date there are 26 other states which are members of the

education programs is something that New York City itself will be responsible for.

The City University and private universities within the City of New York will have the same mandates in terms of meeting standards for state approval of the teacher education programs as upstate or out of New York City institutions will have imposed on them. Now how these standard will affect or effect New York City licensing requirements is something I can't respond to. But there will be intermittent functional involvement of the professionals, the community, and the city-wide Board of Education in the development of these standards.

Q: If that community has not been represented traditionally in determining policy of instruction, what place does that community have in the consortia? And should not that community be represented in plans such as the consortia?

Cronin: It's a question which re-stated is: Should not the deaf person be represented on the consortium.

Hoag: When we got involved with the reconsideration of standards all the way through i the area of the deaf, the initial advisory committee involved with the deaf community, the Virginia Beach Conference involved with the deaf community, and when you say consumers, too, it also considers parents of deaf children. And I think that is an essential ingredient and it should be a part of the consortium very definitely. And I'd say as one admonition for the composition of this group, this is what's lacking.

I think that's a decision that should be reached by the consortium. Mandated to participate are the College/University employing public school

to be fulfilling the objectives established. But our Regents felt a need to accommodate some of the majority feelings in the Legislature that the state had to make a conversion to CBTE. We had set a date of 1980 as the date by which all provisionally certified teachers in New York State would be certified on the basis of demonstrated skills, knowledges, and attitudes. And that was not sufficient to the Regents that we had established a 1980 date. Human resources in the Department are no different than they are in the colleges and schools across the state. We have a staff of something like six professionals in the Bureau of Teacher Education who have the responsibility of approving and evaluating teacher education programs. There are 110 institutions in New York State who prepare teachers. And within those institutions there are almost 2000 individual teacher education programs. To convert all of those by 1973 would have been an inhuman task. Further Connie Cook's bill didn't carry any kind of financial support. So at the request of the Regents, we established a timetable that we knew would aggravate some, appease others, and yet accommodate the human resources that we had in the Division of Teacher Education and Certification staff. There are a number of things that led to the timetable. One was the date of 1980, by which all of this had to be accomplished. The other factor that was critical was that within the last three or four years we had changed a number of other certification requirements and that to put these programs in the position of having to convert their programs to competency based seemed somewhat unreal. So we went to those programs or certification areas that had not been changed within the last few years and

established that those would be the areas that could be required to convert to a competency based program initially. And then again with the human resources in the Division being a critical factor, we decided that we would alternate a heavy certification area with a light certification area. Elementary teacher requirements were last revised in 1966, announced in 1963 to become mandatory in 1966. So they immediately came to the forefront. There are 80 colleges in New York State that prepare elementary teachers. That presented a considerable burden to us. The special education certification requirements had not been revised for a number of years prior to that and since special education certification requirements are oftentimes extensions of elementary teacher education requirements, that became a natural linkage to the elementary certification requirements in the conversion schedule. These two constitute the first group to be effective in February of 1975.

Then as I said, we decided we needed a relatively light certification area, one in which not too many people are continually applying for certification. So we put school administrators and supervisors in the second wave for 1976. Then a heavy certification area, secondary academic subjects, in a third wave, pupil personnel services, in the fourth wave and last occupational certification requirements in the fifth wave for 1979 because they will, this coming September 1, 1974, be required to implement new certification requirements that were just adopted by the Regents in 1971. So you see the mandate of two changes on them successively would have been a terrible burden because they are now just in the process of submitting proposals for their

teacher education programs as a result of the Regents 1971 enactment regulation. That constitutes the timetable. To meet the demands of the Regents, which in a sense has to accommodate to the demands of the Legislature, we established a five year conversion timetable, and it may sound very unrealistic to you but to us it makes a little bit of sense. And that's how it stands.

Q: My question is related to the nature of the deadlines. Feedback from colleagues varies. Some say the deadline is in the nature of a commitment in good faith for a preliminary CBTE program; others see it as a final product.

Mackey: There are three levels of State Education Department approval under the new format. One is preliminary; that's the first level of approval. The second will be conditional, and the third one will be continuing approval. Continuing approval will probably be for a maximum of a five year period during which time the program will have to be revisited or reapproved, just to make sure that it is functioning and that there is an evaluation system going on that flows back into the program what is learned as the results of graduates from the program and how well they are performing in the field.

But getting to your basic question, preliminary approval, because of the time line which I will agree with you is quite unrealistic, does place on program developers a huge responsibility that is not supported by any kind of financial commitment. We will be quite flexible in granting preliminary approval to a program proposal that a consortium will develop. Now I'll speak more to the criteria for preliminary program approval early this afternoon. But I do want you to know that we will be looking for a commitment from the program

participants. We will be looking for a derivation of the roles and responsibilities and how they relate to the competency. But when it comes to the delineation of the competencies, I agree with you, and we know that they will be very grossly stated, if you'll pardon the expression. What we will hope is that during the preliminary approval stage that the program developers will refine the proposal so that when it comes time for the second stage approval, the conditional approval, that they will be in a more acceptable state.

Q: Are you saying that there are or are not specifics to evaluate criteria that are available to judge the plans that will be evolved in this consortium?

Mackey: There are some standards that the state will use in evaluating the proposal for preliminary approval and those standards, or criteria if you will, I will enumerate these later.

Q: Has any provision been made to involve the Board of Examiners in the City of New York in this or are they going to have their own licensing procedure on top of the competency based program?

Mackey: You know we have already had two meetings with members of the Board of Examiners and the Executive Officer for Personnel, Mr. Arakowi, in the city in terms of the manner in which the New York City schools will be involved, particularly in light of the decentralization aspect which gives responsibility for elementary and intermediate education to the local community and then secondary and special programs being the responsibility of the Central Board. So we are continuing to work with them. How New York City revises its current licensing system to accommodate State approval of teacher

district, and the teachers. They can involve, they may involve other kinds of groups in the consortium. Parents, the consumer, the deaf, or students could be included. There is no prohibition against that. But how do you arrive at that decision? I would assume it would come out of the consortia arrangement. What we have involved here at this meeting, strictly speaking are the mandated members of the consortia as a starting point because I think that most of you are not fully aware, of what is involved and what kind of time lines you are working against. Now probably we have a peculiar element in the area of the deaf. We may have a similar one with the blind, but I'm not sure we have it with the speech and hearing or with the mentally retarded. How much contribution would the mentally retarded adult make in the consortium? I don't know whether the speech handicapped child who becomes an adult would be in a consortium. Maybe they would. You know there is no prohibition against it, but I think probably that decision should come out of the beginning consortia discussions.

Q: But are you not indicating that there is a differentiation in decision making roles, in other words, there is a weighting of the participants in the consortia?

Mackey: I would like to reaffirm what Dick has said. In the guidelines for program approval, we have mandated the three agencies of the professional, the teacher, himself or herself, the employer, the school district, which in a sense is the consumer although other agencies may be considered consumers, and the institution of higher education. The manner in which the consortium forms in terms of voting power or strengths or weaknesses or input or what have

you will be determined by at least the three mandated parties, and then they in turn will assume the responsibility for admitting into the consortium other agencies that they feel should be involved in the development and implementation of the teacher education programs.

Hehir: Just to pursue that, you know I think what you are touching upon is the emotional involvement of maybe a deaf adult who happens to have ....

Audience: Performance based programs are really based on pupil outcome. So in a sense, the range of assumptions that you are trying to generate have to do with performance criteria other than population. Now that population represents a normal population in my perspective. And it seems to me that traditionally that that population has really functioned as an inferior population. I think if criteria are to be developed, I think part of that is to give the professionals, the traditional professionals the insight into the deaf perspective as a deaf person lives it. And I grant you that there are levels of performance for hearing people as well as deaf people, but I think from my understanding of the direction and humanization of deaf education, the deaf are becoming, are taking a rightful place in the decision making process.

Hehir: I think though you have to define what you mean by deaf and what population you are talking about, the special school population or public school population, and what kind of persuasion.

Audience: I think in a broad sense, the traditional, the deaf community, the functioning deaf community.

Hehir: Well I don't know what that functioning deaf community is, you see. I think the consortium is going to have to address that question and

then resolve it. Because one consortium might, upstate for example, might do it differently from downstate.

# CHAPTER III

## DELIBERATIONS OF CONFEREES

The participants having been originally selected to include administrators, university/college coordinators, university and school practicum supervisors, cooperating teachers, and student teachers, for specific sessions were organized by role, by teaching level or level of specialization, and by tentative consortia groupings. Conferees were then directed to respond to specific questions, reference materials having been made available to the participants individually. A special conference library was stocked with current and relevant C/PBTE materials.

### Role Alike Groups: The Issues

Administrators
College/University Coordinators
School Practicum Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers
Student Teachers

Discussion Session:

1. What are the critical issues arising from CBTE as you perceive them in your role?

2. What are your specific concerns and what suggestions can you offer for their resolution?

References: 1. Notes from presentations of four Speakers as their input relates to PBTE.

2. Paper: A NEW STYLE OF CERTIFICATION.

The critical issues arising from C/PBTE as determined in the role-alike group discussions were: (1) Determinations of competencies of teachers of the hearing impaired; (2) Communication among and between schools, uni-

versities, and their respective and involved staffs, and determination of the role responsibilities of each; (3) Standards for the selection of student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university and school supervisors; (4) Provision of in-service training to school staffs; (5) Hiring procedures and practices; (6) Reciprocity between and among universities within and outside New York State; and (7) University/college specialization according to the standards set by the Council on Education of the Deaf. The concerns expressed by the groups will be discussed as related to these issues.

Competencies

Concern was expressed as to the possible composition of the consortium and the relative weighting of the constituencies represented by consortium members. Unresolved questions included whether the university should delineate the competencies for approval or whether the requisite competencies should be generated by the consortium. A second question raised was the possibility of a consortium of university members only either statewide or regional to develop a curriculum to insure a common core of demonstrated competency for all graduates of New York State approved programs.

It was emphasized that each university would maintain its individual integrity based on its own philosophical position and special strengths in content area.

Role Responsibilities and Communication

All groups reflected concern in some degree regarding their respective responsibilities in the preparation of teachers. To resolve apparent

conflicts it was urged that guidelines be established in a cooperative effort by university and school personnel to delineate the responsibility for the presentation and formulation of instructional methodologies and philosophies in order to avoid polarization of university and school.

Inherent in the said delineation of roles is the high degree of communication necessary to establish and clarify specific responsibilities of university and school staff in the planning and supervising of student teaching experience.

Therefore, it becomes incumbent upon the university and school to establish mechanisms for feedback relative to the ordering and supervision of student teaching experience.

Standards for Selection of Personnel

The process of selecting student teachers should be re-assessed and account for differences in requisite entering behaviors. A more formalized mechanism for evaluating the competencies and knowledge of current practices of school and university practicum staff, including supervisors and cooperating teachers should be established.

In-service Training

A particular concern was that of acquainting cooperating teachers and supervisory staff of the practicum centers with the process, terminology, and implications of C/PBTE. It was suggested that workshops or seminars be conducted by the university for the staffs of practicum centers. The cost of such in-service programs was a concommitant concern, but no resolution was provided as to whether the school, the teacher, the state, or the university would be financially responsible.

Hiring Practices and Procedures

Administrators were particularly concerned with the effects of C/PBTE on their right to hire their respective staffs. Specifically the concerns involved CED certified graduates not having attended a New York State C/PBTE approved program and C/PBTE gradutates not having CED certification either within or outside New York State.

The CED national professional standards apply to university programs which recommend graduates for national certification. The reciprocal agreements among states for approval of graduates from C/PBTE programs might result in persons having met CBTE program approval in another state and yet not meeting the New York State requirements. The question appears to be one of weighting and predicting which might best be resolved by establishing an evaluation process by the university. Such a process would apply similarly to those experienced teachers in need of CED accreditation, and for those teachers who request to be recertified under the competency based mandate.

Reciprocity

A major concern of the state, and for potential teachers was whether students enrolled in one New York State approved C/PBTE program might be accepted without loss of credit by another New York university/college for practicum experience only. Since at the present time most universities/colleges having New York State approval recommend for certification only those who have undertaken student teaching under their direction, the problem presented is realistic and has implications for both the student and the institution of higher education.

University/College CED Specialization

One concern registered was which level or levels of specialization would be programmed in the five colleges and universities in New York State. It was expected that all universities/colleges would not have programs at all CED levels: preschool, elementary, secondary, and multihandicapped. This concern was related to the availability of practicum centers. Inferred here is the statement that each college and university is required to make public its competencies and preparation for each level as well as the practicum settings used.

## Delineated Competencies by Role

Workshop Session: Developing Competencies - Role-Alike Groups

1. Which major competencies, in your judgment, demonstrate acceptable levels of competence in your specific role?

2. When, where, and how are these best developed?

3. Who sould assume responsibility for developing them: Teacher Education Centers? Field Agencies?

References: AACTE booklet PBTE: What Is the State of the Art?
Council on Education of the Deaf Standards for Certification of Teachers of the Hearing Impaired

### Administrators

Delineated by the group were the following, considered as key competencies for administrators:

the ability to change an attitude;

to motivate staff;

to communicate with staff;

to function as an educator;

to influence and lead staff;

to know how to use time;

to delegate authority;

to select those to whom to delegate responsibilities;

and the ability to make better and responsible decisions which is the core of all of the above.

### Supervisors

A basic requirement was that of demonstrated competence as a master teacher

and the following attitudes, knowledges, and skills:

Attitude of flexibility, of positive-ness and support of student teachers and their potential contributions to education of the hearing impaired.

Ability to work effectively and to lead staff members with a positive attitude;

to demonstrate the competencies expected of student teachers;

to give and to accept constructive criticism;

to share expertise with colleagues;

to accept feedback relative to her supervisory competencies.

Cooperating Teachers

Emphasized were master teaching skills in and knowledge of:

Classroom management
Diagnostic techniques
Record keeping techniques
Child development of both the normal and hearing impaired
Affective domain
Current trends in education and research
Individualization of instruction based on test and task analysis

Ability to interrelate on a positive level with parents, administrators, colleagues, and the community.

Willingness and cooperativeness to become a cooperating teacher.

Ability to observe and analyze in a constructive and honest manner and an ability to demonstrate before groups.

University Coordinator

Delineated by the group were the following, considered as key competencies.

Demonstrated knowledge and application of the following areas:

Educational, philosophical, and psychological foundations;
Learning theory;
History of education of the deaf;
Normal child development.

Communication processes including:
- Normal language development;
- Sensory processing;
- Auditory behaviors;
- Psycholinguistic theory;
- Neurological systems;
- Audio-vocal system;
- Visual and auditory perception.

Learning strategies; techniques of measurement and diagnosis.

Management of behaviors and settings, including the learning milieu.

Techniques of guiding child and parent; skill in interrelating with parents, non-school agencies, and interdisciplinary teams.

Leadership and professional development relating to attitude towards teaching the hearing impaired, towards the community, state and national affairs.

Developing and assessment of delivery systems for the hearing impaired.

Knowledge of the total conceptualization of education in general and of the current political scene as it affects education.

Students Teachers

Specified knowledges and skills for student teachers include:

Familiarity with the history, especially in normal education, of current methods and philosophies.

Familiarity with the development of the normal hearing child, including physical, psychological, socio-emotional, linguistic and cognitive aspects.

A strong foundation in the approaches to teaching language to hearing impaired children including the means of implementing natural and analytic methods.

Knowledge of the various modes of communication with an understanding of their philosophies and uses; of the basic characteristics of the phonemic components of speech involving and understanding of the articulatory mechanisms, the manner of production, the developmental process, the methods of teaching relating specifically to problems of hearing impaired children.

Knowledge of the anatomy and physiology of the speech and hearing

mechanisms in order to understand the processes involved, a basic foundation in audiology including familiarity with the types of hearing aids, audiograms and their interpretation, and amplification systems.

Ability to diagnose and evaluate a child's present level of performance including linguistic, educational, and social status and future poten[illegible].

Knowledge of the content of aptitude and diagnostic tests including the areas of speech, receptive and expressive language, psychology, audiology, social and intellectual, and an understanding of their interpretation and their application to the child's development.

Knowledge of the developmental steps involved in the teaching of specific curriculum subjects, of techniques by which to individualize lessons in order to meet the particular needs of children, of the various methods of behavior modification, of the various types of handicaps and their ramifications when coappearing with deafness.

Skills include the ability to:

- Observe and record behavior;
- Employ specific behavior modification techniques;
- Interpret audiograms;
- Operate various amplification systems;
- Analyze and adapt standard materials for use with deaf children (an example, the reading kits in series);
- Do a task analysis and prepare tasks using appropriate materials and techniques;
- Employ specific techniques to teaching speech to deaf children;
- Employ a specific language approach successfully;
- Incorporate auditory training techniques appropriate to individual children;
- Recognize the additional problems aside from deafness;
- Know appropriate agencies for referral.

## Levels of Specialization

Discussion Session:

Early Childhood Education
Elementary
Secondary
Multihandicapped

## Guidelines for Practicum

### Early Childhood Education

It was recommended that:

A continuing education program be established for early childhood personnel in cooperation with the university and practicum centers, and that two subgroups be contained within this area of specialization as CED now requires: ages zero to three, and three to six;

Two practicum settings be required for those in early childhood, one with hearing children and one with hearing impaired children within the above age groups;

Careful consideration be made of each practicum setting before placing a student and that practicum include hopefully all of the following:
- involvement in early identification
- parent counseling
- participation within family settings within the home
- hearing and hearing aid evaluations
- use of hearing aid
- development of communication skills within this age group emphasizing the use of residual hearing,

Normal child development be emphasized including language, speech, social, emotional, physical, sensory, perceptual, and cognitive development;

Knowledge of deafness include the spectrum from infancy to adulthood;

Skills be developed to deal effectively with and within the interprofessional community;

Individualized interdisciplinary programs be established within the university to provide the unique skills for the relatively few persons needed to function in the field of deafness in certain specified roles.

Elementary Education

Recommendations regarding the practicum at the elementary level:

Broaden the instructional and professional base at the university level by:

Selecting instructional staff and doctoral students at the university level on a criterion which involves successful teaching experience in the classroom for the hearing impaired;

Having university instructional staff keep in touch with the classroom scene by periodic or routine teaching experiences in the classroom for the hearing impaired;

Utilizing persons from the practicum centers to set up the course goals and curriculum of a seminar for student teachers;

Utilizing supervisory staff of the practicum center as part time instructional staff at the university level;

Inviting selected representatives from the practicum center to serve as visiting speakers for the university level courses.

Broaden the student teacher's professionalism:

At the cognitive level by including in the instructional curriculum:
- Knowledge of the various methodologies
- Expertise in varying forms of communication
- Using the summer months for the knowledge level and the fall and spring terms for the skill level
- Knowledge of the various instructional philosophies

At the interpersonal relationship level by increasing his/her ability to handle dialogue communication between:
- Teacher and parent
- Teacher and teacher
- Teacher and administrator
- Teacher and ancillary organizations and/or personnel.

At the experiential level by providing experiences with:
- Varieties of hearing classroom experiences (open classroom, team teaching)
- Varieties of settings for the hearing impaired child (self contained, BOCES, resource room, itinerant, integrated and residential)
- Varieties of university instructional settings with possible exchange between New York City and upstate teacher

preparation centers in order that the student might view another type of practicum center

Varieties of regional programs through routine visitations of several days duration at a variety of educational settings

Secondary Level

It was recommended that:

Specific competencies be written for the preparation of teachers of the hearing impaired at the secondary level to include teachers in resource rooms as well as teachers in subject matter areas. Those involved in this group registered general concerns regarding the process of developing consortia and of the performance of appropriate tasks.

Consequently, it was recommended that:

Funding be made available to release staff members of both school and university to develop CBTE proposals.

The number of persons working on each CBTE consortium be limited, but that within each consortium group there should be representatives of both public and private schools.

More than one university may form a single consortium but/and the consortium should not be unduly influenced by any one participating agency.

Competencies established by the Consortia should provide for levels of instruction on one level without restricting the opportunity of a student to move to another level.

Consortia should develop programs that include provisions for:
certifying out-of-state teachers;
presently employed uncertified teachers who will not be grandfathered in P/CBTE;
providing the process for CED accreditation.

School or agencies should be aware of their several options:
1) to join one or more consortia
2) not to join any consortia in a formal agreement
3) to provide practicum experience for students for one or more consortia.

Multihandicapped

The following recommendations were made:

There should be a definition of "multihandicapped" in terms of the primary needs of the pupils.

University personnel should work with agencies and practicum settings in determining a needs assessment to which it should respond, e.g., number of teachers needed, specialized skills and attitudes desired.

Programs for the preparation of teachers of multihandicapped deaf should reflect the primary needs of children including these three categories:

1) children not making progress for no apparent reason;
2) children with below average potential;
3) children with behavior problems.

University programs should emphasize socialization and behavior management skills as well as skills in creating a learning environment.

Child advocacy skills should be stressed; teachers should be action oriented.

Teachers should develop a vast repertoire of educational strategies with heavy emphasis on diagnostic prescriptive teaching.

Practicum experiences should include a variety of educational settings including several services and disciplines.

There should be experiences in working with other disciplines (interprofessional experiences).

Programs should provide knowledge of existing and potential facilities and services related to the total and future development of MH deaf persons.

Some university programs should assume the responsibility for preparation of MH children beyond the elementary years.

## Consortia

Canisius College
SUNY Geneseo
Hunter College
New York University
Teachers College, Columbia University

Discussion:

1. In a consortium, what are the implications of CBTE?

2. What are the concerns specific to consortium as a unit of goverance?

References: Excerpted papers
PBTE
Competency Based (J. Gilmore)
Conceptual Model of PBTE

Issues and concerns pertained to problems relative to the practicum center, university/college, the consortium, and to the student teacher.

Problems relative to the practicum center:

a. Lack of time for organizational and communicative meetings

b. Role of the university supervisor at the practicum center

c. Disparity between university and practicum center calendars

d. Role of the departmental supervisor at the practicum center in relation to student teacher observation and instruction

e. Number of student teachers a practicum center can adequately handle

f. Need for variety of student teaching experiences

g. Use of ancillary agencies at the practicum center

h. Use of modules by the practicum center

i. Use of observation and demonstrations

j. Possibility of disparity between standards of practicum center and the university

Problems relative to the university:

a. Need for a basic core of courses

b. The importance, if any, of general education prior to moving into a specific area of hearing impaired

c. The need to establish a philosophy upon which the program is based

d. Entry levels of students and the role of pre-testing and variation in programs

e. Need for terminal behaviors of all students to be the same, and setting those terminal behaviors

f. Extent to which a student teacher defines his own program

g. Difficulty in asking students to select a level or area prior to actual field experience

h. Need for a common core of experiences preceding or during preparation that gives the student a good concept of children in general

i. Need for ongoing assessment and evaluation of student teachers

j. Difficulty of student teacher placed in complicated field experiences such as open classrooms

k. Best preparation by an overview or by a specific instructional philosophy

l. Acquisition of competencies for the teacher of the multihandicapped through experiences, not only university knowledge

m. Delineation of steps when student is failing to attain competencies

n. Caution to avoid designing a program de-emphasizing behaviors not easily measured, that is, inter-personal relations, value systems, learning environment

Problems relative to the consortium:

a. How it is to be organized

b. Graduates from the university-practicum center not being hired by

the preparing practicum center upon graduation

c. Need for definition of the teacher of the hearing impaired--what ages, level, and classifications

d. Form of recognition to be given a speech and hearing therapist on entering the program or in position employment

e. How to handle the certified teacher of the hearing impaired who wishes to move from one level to another

f. Need for defining the university as to whether it is a regional school serving employment needs of its consortium only, or more national serving needs of many schools and agencies

Problems relative to the student:

a. Cost of entry behavior evaluation in lieu of course work

b. Appraisal or acceptance of competencies and subsequent certification in other states

c. Application of life experiences to CBTE

## Guidelines and Recommendations by Tentative Consortia Groups

The following guidelines and recommendations were directed both to the New York State Department of Education and the university-practicum centers concerned with developing consortia and evolved from discussion groups meeting on several occasions.

Workshop Sessions: Developing Competencies. Format for Submission of Proposal.
Reference: PBTE Vol. 1. No. 4. November 1972.
New York State Department of Education Master Plan.

1. What assumptions or beliefs underlie your program: e.g., role of hearing impaired persons in society, characteristics of teacher education, nature of learning, etc.?

2. In developing competencies what is the role of:
   Teacher Preparation Centers — Cooperating Teachers
   Practicum Centers — Student Teachers
   Supervisors

3. Who assumes which responsibilities for developing which competencies where?

4. What is your community and what is its role in developing teacher preparation programs?

5. How can divergent requirements for certification be met: NYC; NYSED; CED?

It was recommended that the following steps be taken in establishing a consortium:

By the university:

1) Establishment of a written statement concerning the basic philosophy to be employed in teacher education.

2) An exploration of some possible models of consortia:
   a) a single-consortia model
   b) a multi-consortium model

3) An exploration of some possible school settings in which parity might exist in the area of philosophy and practicum desires.

4) Design of program ensuring requirements of CED accreditation be met.

5) Determination of program levels and specializations.

By the schools:

1) Orientation of the staff to the concept of PBTE

2) Statement of basic philosophy to be employed in teacher-education in the PBTE model

3) Finding personnel who are interested in working with PBTE consortium on an intensive basis

4) Exploration of some possible university consortium in which parity might exist in the area of philosophy and practicum desires.

Problems the tentative consortium organization must determine:

1) Degree to which parity exists

2) Definition of the teacher group to be represented, union or NYSAED

3) Establishment of a time table for operation

4) Prerequisite teaching of the deaf for teacher representation

5) Inservice component--a cooperative venture

6) Caution re: de-emphasis of affective domain, value systems, learning environment

7) Pluralism of instructional approaches

8) Number of agencies to be represented or to serve as consultants

Immediate recommendations to New York State:

That the State provide a delay in the date by which the PBTE certification must become effective, either until February 1976 or better, until June 30, 1976.

That the State provide sufficient funding to:

1) Provide inservice training on PBTE for teachers who would be involved in consortium including public and private facilities

2) Provide for released time of teaching staff to work on PBTE consortium for both

3) Permit state-wide meetings of consortia to increase communication and resolve common problems.

That these recommendations be directed to the Governor, Regents, and Legislature.

That NYSAED should be used as a vehicle supporting the CBTE concept.

# CHAPTER IV

# CONFERENCE SUMMARY

LEO. E. CONNOR, Ed.D.
Lexington School for the Deaf

I must confess that I'm not sure what was meant by asking me to do a "summary" of this conference. If it was to be a short version of everything that took place in the group discussions, I found that to be impossible. If I was supposed to repeat in my own words what the major speakers said, I would rather refer you to the Proceedings that will be published sometime after this conference concludes. So, what I've compromised on is a list of unresolved issues as well as my unvarnished but still incomplete impressions of what we did during the past three days. If my definition of a summary, therefore, seems to be incomplete, or perhaps unkind in some instances or differs from your own perception — then you'll have to conclude that my competence as a summarizer needs improvement and that I cannot graduate or apply for State Certification in that area of professional activity.

## STAGES OF OUTLOOK

The participants of this Conference seemed to have entered at different levels of information, concern, and perception. It appeared to me that the University representatives knew more and had more apprehension. The practicum representatives had little or no prior information and therefore were unconcerned.

As the first day's presentations unfolded, there were global concepts perceived, and big words and questions offered in lieu of analysis. Such items as "Where's the money for this?" or "What's a competency?" or "What's 'the State' up to?" seemed to typify the earliest reactions of those individuals who were willing to react. Many members of the group just kept quiet.

By the first afternoon and evening, the ventilation became more general, and we all seemed to be getting out our favorite points of view, our favorite gripes, the recollection of unwanted and unappreciated events, our sardonic "digs" and critical comments about "that fellow at the university who didn't know what it took to run a school"; or "those cooperating teachers and school supervisors who always said they were too busy to help me"; or "those student teachers who arrived in my classroom with lots of big terms and lists of behavioral objectives, but didn't know how to put on a kid's hearing aid".

We next went through the questioning stage with long lists of insightful and not so insightful questions. A few examples:

1. How were the current teachers to be upgraded?
2. How were the student teachers to be evaluated by the consortium?
3. Was the practicum school staff to receive inservice help?
4. How could student teachers give more time to practicum experiences?
5. Was more time available to the practicum centers from university personnel?
6. Why were cooperating teachers lacking in knowledge of behavioral objectives?
7. How was a practicum center going to work with two or three consortia?

8. Why were some student teachers so negative about their practicum centers and/or universities?

These questions poured out of our "role alike" groups as well as out of our consortia meetings. It didn't seem to matter what the groupings were during the first and much of the second day. We were in a general questioning and, occasionally, a cynical mood.

About noon of yesterday, we shifted our attention to the naming of specific competencies. We may not have been sure what a competency was, but that didn't stop us from naming them. The first competencies produced were generalized ones or items that were extensions of problems that we are experiencing currently.

For example, a generalized competency from the administrator's group that universities should consider was, "The ability of a teacher to work in faculty groups". On the other hand, a competency springing out of a problem which the administrators felt was a universal current need was, "The ability to teach speech to the deaf".

We made lists of these kinds of competencies, and I hope they will be helpful to later stages of consortia development. But, I'm not so sure. At that stage of our work, we really didn't know where we were going, so the activity can be likened to a stringing of objects on a chain so we'd have some intellectual clothing to cover our newly discovered professional nakedness.

The next phase of our three days of deliberations was the debating stage. At this point, the confusion and disagreements surfaced to become strong differences of viewpoint with one practicum center disagreeing with

another center's philosophy, objectives, or procedures. And everyone, of course, was mad at "the State" for the time schedule. This stage could be characterized by examples like these: Who is in charge of the consortium? We're not ready to commit our faculty if the university doesn't help. We won't sign off on your February 1975 application unless we obtain some concessions.

Part of this stage of groupness was the slapstick mood of last evening, probably generated by exhaustion and concern as we looked to the end of the Conference and the major gaps in our results to date.

The third day of the Conference dawned, and although some of the participants agreed that the Conference should end with definite decisions, an agreed upon list of competencies, and a fall schedule that suggested how many meetings would be held and with whom to meet the February 1975 deadline, others could not refrain from continuing previous discussions in an attempt to arrive at "satisfactory answers". Thus, a tug of war characterized our Friday morning session: the effort to arrive at agreements among some members of the consortia, and the conferees who believed that details couldn't be settled until further discussions were held to explain divergent viewpoints and/or agency relationships and difficulties.

So, here we are at the summary session, and I'm supposed to tell you what you've accomplished. Unfortunately, I cannot do so adequately because, as a participant in this conference, I did not keep myself above the fray, and I did not visit with enough of you to hear your discussions. I am sorry that my own professional responsibilities precluded adequate circulation and objective reflection.

However, I have attempted a different kind of analysis. I will try to share with you what I think we've learned and what we have to do next.

First, the facts we have to face:

1. The State Education Department of New York has mandated a new teacher certification process by February 1975 for five universities/colleges in the State and for any other university/college which wishes to prepare certificated teachers of the deaf.

2. The preliminary, provisional, and permanent approval of consortia programs and the certification of teachers of the deaf under a competency based teacher preparation program are upon us, and we are all obligated by our professional objectives, responsibilities and/or position to make a decision whether we wish to become involved.

3. There is a general outline of the consortia group process to be followed whereby college and/or university students who wish to become teachers of the deaf may enter and successfully leave a preparation program. It seems to be agreed that this new process involves the following: an entry evaluation; a set of varying field related experiences to be defined and publicized which the student is to demonstrate mastery of; an agreement by a group of at least three groups as to what constitutes such a program; and its successful completion with heavy evaluation emphasis. After State approval of such a program description, graduates of the program will be certified as eligible for employment in the public schools of New York as teachers of the deaf.

4. It seems to be important to stress the State Education Department's own words that "A competence based system permits the widest variety of program design since it does not prescribe any predetermined set of courses or learning activities." It was also agreed at this Conference that the time necessary for completion of a preparation program was flexible and to be individually determined by the consortium group so as to "enhance individual learning styles."

OBJECTIVES OF THE CONFERENCE

At this point I would like to discuss with you my impressions of the Conference goals. As you know, in the materials that were presented to us on the first day of the Conference, there were two basic assumptions. One was that this Conference was convened with the desire on the part of all of us to articulate the components of performance based teacher

education. Second, that the deliberations of these three days present some kind of recommendations which would help the New York State certification process as it relates to the teachers of the hearing impaired.

Now, taking each of the five specific objectives:

1. To "develop awareness of PBTE and its characteristic components". I think we carried out this responsibility to the fullest extent. Certainly I have become very much aware of the new indicated direction that the New York State Education Department has initiated.

2. To "provide an opportunity to discuss competency based teacher preparation and its implications for teacher education by role, by level, and by consortium". Yes, I think we certainly have been discussing for many hours, formally and informally, in all and every sort of way, the teacher preparation program.

3. To "delineate and explore key issues". Now, I'm sure that we did explore almost all the key issues as far as we could possibly know them. But I'm not at all convinced that we "delineated" these in any succinct form, nor did we phrase them in any kind of desirable prose. But we made a good attempt at both of these matters concerning the key issues in the development of the PBTE program.

4. To "initiate consortia planning to meet the New York State planning". I think we have taken some first steps in meeting this objective, but, certainly, we have not formally initiated any consortia planning. Rather, we have been exploring together the possibilities in informal groups as given to us by the planners of this conference, so that we could have a "dry run" and an indication of what we would face in planning throughout the rest of the summer and in the fall period.

5. To "outline tentative guidelines for practicum at varying specialization levels". This, too, we started, but we made no commitment as constituent groups toward the carrying out of this objective.

It would seem to me that all of our questions, doubts, confusions, rebellions, and cussedness exhibited during the past three days are in large part a normal aspect of the expectations for what Richard Hehir called "the beginning", and what I would add is "the beginning of a huge undertaking". Please notice that I did not say that this undertaking was an impossible one. I said it was huge because it involves new relationships among a number of groups who already have had a set of arrangements and relationships that were developed over recent or many years. To ask each of us to invest sizable amounts of time, effort, personnel, or even money into a mandated program is to expect resistance, anger, and frustration prior to our finding the pathway to developing more positive attitudes toward this important and, I think, most necessary task of redesigning teacher preparation programs for the deaf in New York State.

So, what are some of the positive and negative impressions that we made on each other during the past three days? Some overall reactions first. It is my guess that many of us were impressed by the perceptiveness and forthrightness of the student teacher reports. We were also affected positively by the significant statements made by the teacher representatives in our midst. I was aware of what I took to be the defensiveness of the university personnel and by the aggressive strident tone of the administrative group. On the other hand, I can report to you that the administrators discussed a tremendous number of vital points

in an open and self-critical fashion, and that the university group showed that they had a most comprehensive and insightful viewpoint on all phases of teacher preparation programs. The teacher group, it seemed, to me, was too quiet and perhaps fearful of talking up around their administrators while the student teachers seemed to be unaware of complexities and the variety of school and university pressures which might compromise their ideal statement of what a program should be.

First, we now know the facts and future expectations that face us concerning PBTE.

Second, we have an adequate perception of the process that must be carried out. The consortia meetings we had during this conference were an excellent example of what faces us as we strive to arrive at an "agreement" on a teacher preparation plan.

Third, we must answer a lot of detailed questions.

More specifically, all of our groups asked questions by the carload and voiced minor and major criticisms of various aspects of current programs. I preferred to leave these latter comments out and rather to present a sample of what I call "unresolved issues".

UNRESOLVED ISSUES

1. The teacher of the deaf

   a. What ages or grades are covered by such a teacher or will we have five different definitions of such a teacher around the State?

   b. Can flexibility, individuality, and variety be encompassed in the State's mandate "to assure the public that a teacher can enable children to learn?"

   c. Should there be any prerequisites for persons wishing to enter the field or is this new program to stress an "open admissions" policy?

2. The program of preparation

   a. Will the preparation program generally take one year, one and a half years, two, or three years to accomplish all that everyone in the consortium wishes to include?

   b. Must specific competencies be taught?

   c. Will competencies from one university be comparable to competencies at another university/college?

   d. Will students have to pay for a full program of teacher preparation even though they require only part of the competencies listed? In a similar vein, how can students estimate the cost of a program if it might take one, two, three years to achieve the required competencies?

3. Evaluation aspect

   a. What about the reciprocity question of persons coming from out of state?

   b. Who settles major differences of opinion concerning a student teacher's achievements among the various groups in a consortium?

   c. Will the university/college personnel be able to or wish to give up their current control over the program?

   d. What are the specific competencies which the state wishes teachers to have?

4. The cooperating teachers and practicum center

   a. Will CBTE discourage the effective teacher who has excellent interpersonal relationships but who dislikes record keeping and paper work while encouraging the "competent mechanical marvel"?

   b. Will student teachers have to conform excessively to the cooperating teacher's personal expectations or will the student teacher's own goals and desires be respected?

   c. How many teaching specialists does an employing school want or need? And can we condense some of these into general classifications?

   d. What competencies should cooperating teachers and supervisors have?

5. The policy group of the consortium

   a. Why are teachers singled out as a mandated group while supervising personnel and student teachers do not necessarily have to be included?

   b. How are differences to be resolved? Or, what kind of weight is given to the viewpoints of different members of the consortium?

   c. How will competencies be maintained over a period of time if the "renewal" aspects of the program are being challenged by unions and tenure definitions?

I believe that the task of jointly working out the new requirements of a competency based teacher preparation program for the area of the deaf is a worthwhile, huge job that must be accomplished through the best efforts of all of us. I like the idea of a mixed group of professional people with various viewpoints being asked to take on this job. I think the time schedule mandated by the State Department of Education is entirely unreasonable and their current stance of not offering financial resources to accomplish such a job is ridiculous. I think this conference should be firmly on record that we need at least one extra year, until February 1976, to get each of our groups ready to do the competent job we know we can attain. We should be able to study, to discuss, to experiment, to revise our preliminary decisions all without harming the student teachers and our own programs while we go through this year or two of change and trial. I sympathize with the universities and colleges that seem to be hit the hardest by this new program, and I am dismayed by the amount and kind of work required by the practicum center staffs before we can evolve our status in this new program.

STEPS TOWARD CONSORTIUM FORMATION

I have outlined for myself and, hopefully for your assistance, four stages in the consortium formation:

1. Orientation of faculty, particularly the practicum center faculty who have not been involved in the formation of PBTE or in a Conference like this one. This amount of work will have to be done in the fall period since we are already too late in the current school year to accomplish much.

2. Formulation, on a preliminary level, of the philosophy and objectives of a consortium. As I understand the guidelines given us, this is to be a joint formulation by all of the groups and persons concerned in the consortium.

3. Formation of a policy board with some mandated and desirable membership agreeable to all members of the consortium.

4. Establishment of the following time table as a possible necessity for the carrying out of the consortium responsibilities: October 4 and 5 when the New York State Association of Educators of the Deaf meets in New York City. This would be an excellent opportunity to alert and disseminate information concerning this new program to all teachers and professional workers in the educational programs of the hearing impaired; late October meetings of the Policy Board of the Consortia groups. It would seem that these groups should be able to compose the first draft of the consortium statement by November 20, 1974. Revisions of the drafts by the constituents of the consortia groups would take place during December and January either at meetings of their own personnel and then back again as a group of policy makers. Finally, the submission of the finished plan to the State by February 1975.

Now this timetable is the only one that I can recommend to all of you that would be both practical and possible under the guidelines given us by the State Education Department. Personally, I do not believe that this schedule can be met. I do think that it can be met by June 30, 1975, or even better, by the date of February 1976.

As a final set of observations, I would mention two major items for our future consideration. First, I think there is the generalized problem of the "ideal" versus the "practical" outlook. This means to me that we as members of various constituent groups throughout New York State face several quandries of: firstly, time to accomplish the desired programs; secondly, the quandry of money or at least time to plan and administer the discussions

necessary to create such a program; thirdly, we face a quandry of complexity and depth and extent of the competency to be acquired which requires a great deal of discussion and thinking on the part of all our personnel; fourthly, we face a quandry of the nature and ability of the consortium's limitations since each consortium has its own peculiar characteristics with its own history and its own objectives. Each group must take time to re-organize, to grow, to make mistakes, to recoup, and to present finally in a public way some concensus on its overall program.

Now the second major item for future consideration by this group is one that I would personally recommend to you. If the February 1975 deadline is in effect, I do not believe that a practical, realistic plan can be submitted by the consortia. However, if a June 1975 deadline is possible, or even a February 1976 deadline were in effect, then the extra time could be utilized to produce both a realistic and even a desirable set of competencies, evaluations, and experiences for future student teachers of the hearing impaired.

In conclusion then, in spite of all the above doubts and questions, in spite of my last three days of confusion and resentments, I hope we can succeed in improving the New York State teacher preparation program for teachers of the deaf. Although I'm sure we could have worked out a better schedule than the State has given us, and although I hope we offer some strong recommendations to revise the State's mandated process -- if we do produce better teachers of the deaf through such joint efforts of teachers, practicum centers, and universities -- it will have been worth it.

On my own behalf and perhaps in your name as participants, I wish to thank Dick Hehir, Frances Cronin, Ann Mulholland, and any others who helped plan to make this conference possible. It has been an exhausting, frustrating, enjoyable, and valuable professional and social experience.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM

Tuesday, May 28

7:30 - 9:30 p.m. ARRIVAL - SOCIAL - WELCOME

Wednesday, May 29

7:45 - 8:15 a.m. BREAKFAST

9:00 - 11:00 a.m. GENERAL SESSION Parlor A

Welcome and Orientation
Frances I. Cronin, Director
St. Joseph's School for the Deaf
Bronx, New York

Introductory Remarks
Charles C. Mackey, Jr.
Associated Teacher Certification
Division of Teacher Education and Certification
The State Education Department
Albany, New York

Keynote: Competency-Based Teacher Preparation: The Issues

The State Education Department
Richard G. Hehir, Chief
Bureau for Physically Handicapped Children
The State Education Department
Albany, New York

The University
Ann M. Mulholland, Associate Professor
Department of Special Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York

The School
Ralph L. Hoag, Superintendent
Rochester School for the Deaf
Rochester, New York

11:00 - 12:15 p.m. Panel of Keynoters and Mr. Mackey for participant exchange

12:15 - 1:15 p.m. LUNCH

1:30 p.m. GENERAL SESSION

The Role of the State in Competency-Based Teacher Education
Charles C. Mackey, Jr.

2:00 - 3:30 p.m. DISCUSSION SESSION #1

Role-Alike Groups:
"Implications of CBTE for Practitioners"

3:30 p.m. BREAK

Wednesday, May 29

4:00 - 5:00 p.m. GENERAL SESSION

Presentation of summaries of Role-Alike groups:
Key Issues as perceived through discussion

5:30 - 6:00 p.m. SOCIAL HOUR

6:15 - 7:15 DINNER

7:30 - 9:00 p.m. DISCUSSION SESSION #2

Consortia Groups:
"Key Issues: Implications for Implementation"

Thursday, May 30

9:00 - 10:15 a.m. GENERAL SESSION Parlor A

Identifying and Evaluating Competencies - Slide/Tape Presentation

Margaret Lindsey
Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York

10:30 - 12:00 WORKSHOP SESSION #1

Role-Alike Groups
"Developing Competencies: Which? When? Where? How? Who?"

12:15 p.m. LUNCH

1:30 - 2:30 p.m. GENERAL SESSION

Presentation of summaries of Role-Alike Groups:
"Key Competencies as Perceived"

2:30 - 5:00 p.m. WORKSHOP SESSION #2

Consortia Groups
"Developing Competencies"
Object--To identify:
Underlying assumptions of programs
Role of each practitioner in total program
Responsibility of each in developing competencies
Role of the community

5:30 - 6:00 p.m. SOCIAL HOUR

6:15 - 7:15 p.m. DINNER

7:30 - 8:45 p.m. WORKSHOP SESSION #3

Consortia Groups
"Format for Submission of Proposal"

8:45 - 9:15 p.m. GENERAL SESSION

Summaries

Friday, May 31

9:00 - 10:30 a.m. WORKSHOP SESSION #4

Level Groups
"Developing Guidelines: A Beginning?"

10:45 - 12:00 WORKSHOP SESSION #5

Consortia Groups
"Developing Guidelines: The Overview"

12:15 p.m. LUNCH

1:15 p.m. GENERAL SESSION

Conference Summary. Leo E. Connor, Executive Director
Lexington School for the Deaf
Jackson Heights, New York

2:30 p.m. Moving Ahead Together
Richard G. Hehir

3:00 p.m. Adjournment

STEERING COMMITTEE

Carl Birago, J.H.S. 47 for the Deaf, New York City
Frances Cronin, St. Joseph's School for the Deaf, Bronx
Glenn Lloyd, Deafness Research Center, NYU
Ann Mulholland, Teachers College, Columbia University
Eleanor Murphy, St. Joseph's School for the Deaf, Bronx
Eleanor Vorce, Lexington School for the Deaf, New York

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANTS

Herbert Arkebauer (Adm)*
Mill Neck Manor Lutheran School
Box 12
Mill Neck 11765

Andrew Anselmini (Adm)
Junior High School #47
225 East 23rd Street
New York 10010

Carl Birago (SC)
Junior High School #47
New York 10010

Mary Burke (T)
St. Francis de Sales School
260 Eastern Parkway
Brooklyn 11225

Elizabeth Bowman, Ph.D. (T)
57 Hillside Place
Northport 11768
BOCES 3 Suffolk

Elizabeth Bottini (SC)
New York School for the Deaf
Rome 13440

Eleanor Burgess (SC)
13 Fitzhugh Street South
Rochester 14614
City School District Rochester

Leo Connor, Ed.D. (Adm)
Lexington School for the Deaf
30th Avenue at 75th Street
Jackson Heights 11370

Frances Cronin (Adm)
St. Joseph's School for the Deaf
1000 Hutchinson River Parkway
Bronx 10465

Joanne Dugo (T)
45 Dreyer Avenue
Tonawanda
City School System Buffalo

Gloria Duffy (T)
Bureau for Hearing Handicapped Children
500 East 78th Street
New York 10021

Rita Epilone (StuT)
784 President Street
Brooklyn 11215
Hunter College

J. Jay Farman (Adm)
New York State School for the Deaf
401 Turin Street
Rome 13440

Adele Flesher (T)
Junior High School #47
225 East 23rd Street
New York 10010

Daphne Fox (DocStu)
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York 10027

Betty Fricker (T)
Schunnemunk Road
Monroe
BOCES Rockland County

Dorothy-Ann Hammitt (CC)
Assistant Professor
Hunter College
New York

John D. Harrington, Ed.D. (Adm)
Bureau for Hearing Handicapped Children
500 East 78th Street
New York 10021

Richard G. Hehir, Ed.D., Chief (Adm)
Bureau for Physically Handicapped Children
The State Education Department
Albany 12224

Elsie Herden (SC)
Rochester School for the Deaf
1445 St. Paul Street
Rochester 14621

Ralph L Hoag, Ed.D., Sup't (Adm)
Rochester School for the Deaf
1445 St. Paul Street
Rochester 14621

Ronnie Hollander (T)
Lexington School for the Deaf
30th Avenue at 75th Street
Jackson Heights 11370

Beatrice Jacoby, Ed.D. (NYS)
Bureau for Physically Handicapped Children
The State Education Department
Albany 12224

Naomi Kunken (Adm)
Dutch Broadway School
Elmont 11003
BOCES Nassau

Leola Horowitz, Ph.D.
Speech and Hearing Center
Adelphi University
Garden City 11530

Kendall D. Litchfield (Adm)
New York School for the Deaf
555 Knollwood Road
White Plains 10603

Glenn T. Lloyd, Ed.D. (CC)
Associate Professor of Education
New York University
New York 10003

Charles Mackey, Jr., Ed.D. (NYS)
Division of Teacher Education
The State Education Department
Albany 12224

Helena Manrique (StuT)
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York 10027

Linda Marocchi (T)
New York State School for the Deaf
Rome 13440

Marina McGoldrick (T)
Center for the Multiply Handicapped
New York 10029

Ann Mulholland, Ph.D. (CC)
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York 10027

Eleanor Murphy (SC)
St. Joseph's School for the Deaf
1000 Hutchinson River Parkway
Bronx 10465

Deborah O'Brien (StuT)
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York 10027

Theresa O'Connor (T)
St. Joseph's School for the Deaf
1000 Hutchinson River Parkway
Bronx 10465

Helen Page (Adm)
Principal
J.H. 47 School for the Deaf
New York 10010

Joseph Piccolino (NYS)
Bureau for Physically Handicapped Children
The State Education Department
Albany 12224

Gail Pflaster (DocStu)
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York 10027

Barney Rankhorn (CS)
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York 10027

Edith V. Renna (SC)
School for Language and Hearing Impaired Children
500 East 78th Street
New York 10021

Sister Ann Behre, Ed.D. (Adm)
St. Francis de Sales School for the Deaf
260 Eastern Parkway
Brooklyn 11225

Sister Claude Maria (SC)
St. Francis de Sales School
260 Eastern Parkway
Brooklyn 11225

Sister Doris Batt (Adm)
Cleary School for the Deaf
301 Smithtown Boulevard
Lake Ronkonkama 11779

Sister M. Jacqueline O'Donnell (SC)
St. Mary's School for the Deaf
2253 Main Street
Buffalo 14214

Sister Lorretta Young (SC)
St. Mary's School for the Deaf
2253 Main Street
Buffalo 14214

Sister Loyola Marie (Adm)
Caritas School for the Deaf
984 N. Village Avenue
Rockville Center 11570

Sister Mary Delaney (CC)
Canisius College
2001 Main Street
Buffalo 14208

Sister Nora Letourneau, Ph.D. (Adm)
St. Mary's School for the Deaf
2253 Main Street
Buffalo 14214

Cathie Ann Smith (StuT)
Canisius College
2001 Main Street
Buffalo 14208

Roy M. Stelle, Litt. D. (Adm)
New York School for the Deaf
555 Knollwood Road
White Plains 10603

Timothy J. Sugrue (Adm)
School for Language and Hearing Impaired Children
500 East 78th Street
New York 10021

Sandra Tutles (StuT)
New York University
New York 10003

Eleanor Vorce (SC)
Lexington School for the Deaf
30th Avenue at 75th Street
Jackson Heights 11370

Eunice Weidner (Adm)
Mill Neck Manor Lutheran School
Box 12
Mill Neck 11765

Deborah Waterson (StuT)
SUNY
Geneseo

Sydney Wolff (CC)
SUNY
Geneseo

Leonard Zwick (Adm)
Rochester School for the Deaf
1545 St. Paul Street
Rochester 14621

* Adm = Administrator
T = Teacher
SC = School Coordinator
StuT = Student Teacher
CC = College Coordinator
CS = College Supervisor
DocStu = Doctoral Student

APPENDIX C

Tentative Consortia Grouping

Canisius Consortium — Room 1

Participants:

Canisius Coordinator
St. Mary's School Administrator
College Supervisor of Practicum
School Supervisor of Practicum
Cooperating Teacher - St. Mary's
Student Teacher - Canisius
Buffalo City School Teacher

Geneseo Consortium — Room 2

Participants:

Geneseo Coordinator
Rochester School Administrators
N.Y.S. School Administrator (Rome)
Mill Neck Manor Administrator
College Supervisor of Practicum
School Supervisors of Practicum
Cooperating Teacher
Student Teacher
Rochester City School Representative

Hunter Consortium — Room 3

Participants:

Hunter College Coordinator
Bureau Hearing Handicapped Administrator
School for Hearing and Language Impaired Children Administrator
College Supervisor of Practicum
School Supervisor of Practicum
Resource Room Teacher
Cooperating Teacher
Student Teacher
BOCES - Rockland
N.Y.S. - White Plains Administrator
Mill Neck Manor Principal

N.Y.U. Consortium — Room 4

Participants:

- N.Y.U. Coordinator
- J.H.S. 47 Administrator
- St. Francis de Sales Administrator
- College Supervisor of Practicum
- School Supervisors of Practicum
- Cooperating Teachers
- Student Teachers
- Adelphi Coordinator
- Cleary School Administrator
- N.Y.S. - White Plains - Principal
- BOCES #3 - Suffolk

Teachers College Consortium — Room 1

Participants:

- Teachers College Coordinator
- Lexington School Administrator
- St. Joseph's School Administrator
- BOCES - Nassau
- College Supervisor of Practicum
- School Supervisors of Practicum
- Cooperating Teachers
- Student Teacher
- Caritas Administrator

APPENDIX D

Bibliography

Boyd, William E. Address Delivered to Sixteen Regional Meetings of Teachers and Teacher Educators. Albany, New York: State Education Department, Bureau of Teacher Education, Obtober 1973.

Broudy, Harry S. A Critique of Performance Based Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972.

Committee on Professional Preparation and Certification. Standards for the Certification of Teachers of the Hearing Impaired. Washington, D.C.: Council on Education of the Deaf, 1972.

Elam, Stanley. PBTE: What is the state of the art? PBTE Series No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1971.

Gilhool, Joseph T. Competency based teacher education. The Forum, Winter 1973, 4-5.

Houston, R.W., N. Dodle and W.A. Weber. Competency Based Teacher Education Program Design: A Simulation. Westfield, Texas: Competency Based Instructional System, 1973.

Houston, Robert W. Strategies and Resources for Developing a Competency Based Teacher Education Program. Albany, New York: State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education, Multi State Consortium on Performance Based Teacher Education, 1972.

Houston, Robert W. Performance Education: Resources for Performance Based Education. Albany, New York: State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education, Multi State Consortium on Performance Based Teacher Education, 1973.

Phi Delta Kappan, January 1974.

Rosner, B. and P. Kay. Will the promise of C/PBTE be fulfilled? Phi Delta Kappan, January 1974, 290-296.

University of the State of New York. Format for Submission of Teacher Education, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, 1973.

University of the State of New York. A New Style of Certification. Albany, New York: State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, 1971.

APPENDIX E

Checkpoint Number One  Administered Pre and Post-Deliberations

Please check your appropriate role:

| | |
|---|---|
| Administrators | Cooperating Teachers |
| College/U. Coordinators | Student Teachers |
| School Practicum Supervisors | |

Write true or false in front of the question

_____1. CBTE means the university has the primary responsibility for decision making.
_____2. Assessment of teaching behavior of students is the responsibility of the university.
_____3. In CBTE, knowledge precedes practice.
_____4. In CBTE, the emphasis is on the entering behavior rather than the terminal behavior.
_____5. CBTE has implications for competencies of supervisory staff.
_____6. A consortium policy board member has equal authority in decision making.
_____7. The college/university has sole responsibility for submission of the proposal for CBTE that is submitted to NYSED for approval.
_____8. CBTE is a form of individualized instruction.
_____9. Existing university courses can be reshaped to conform to CBTE.
_____10. The policies decided by the consortia supercede the administration of the university.
_____11. Modules do not involve alternatives for the student
_____12. Competencies involve only the cognitive domain.
_____13. The university is responsible for developing knowledge; the practicum center is responsible for skills.
_____14. To develop competencies efficiently, practicum should be based in special schools.
_____15. The desired outcome of the teacher preparation program is dependent upon the candidate selection criteria.
_____16. The CBTE submitted by the university should first meet the CED standards.
_____17. Students preparing to teach under the CBTE program need only to have practicum.
_____18. While the university equates competencies in points, the school equates competencies in clock hours.
_____19. The time that a student will spend at the university in a CBTE program is stable.
_____20. In developing a CBTE program the first chore is to list the competencies.

Checkpoint Number Two Administered Post-Deliberations

Circle the following role that is appropriate to your particular position.

School Administrator
College/University Coordinator
Cooperating Teacher
School Practicum Supervisor
Student Teacher

Match the following:

_____instructional objective
_____competency
_____individualization
_____norm referenced
_____consortium
_____teacher performance
_____objective
_____criterion referenced
_____performance criteria
_____feedback
_____evaluation
_____parity
_____terminal behavioral objectives
_____teaching
_____module

1. an instructional package to meet a discrete behavioral objective
2. objectives which state what learner is able to do at end of instruction
3. systematic generation of statistical analytical information on program activities
4. statement of pattern of behavior the learner can demonstrate
5. collaborative, mutual, deliberative decision making and planning
6. a corrective mechanism for learning how well behavior matches intention
7. demonstrated ability to perform to criterion at function and job levels
8. standard for measuring evidence of achievement
9. what teacher does in classroom to produce changes in learner behavior
10. comparison of performance of student on a relative scale with that of others
11. a process by which teacher and students create a shared environment including sets of values and beliefs
12. the standard to which an individual's performance is compared to behaviors as specified by the objectives
13. organizational instrument facilitating cooperation among agencies
14. a statement specifying a competency to be acquired and demonstrated.
15. activities designed to attend to expressed needs of learner

APPENDIX F

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

Please indicate the extent to which this conference met its stated objectives:

| | (low) 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (high) 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. An awareness of PBTE and its characteristic components was developed. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Opportunity was provided to discuss CBTE and its implications for teacher education by: | | | | | | |
| (a) role | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (b) level | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (c) consortium | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Key issues in the development of PBTE were delineated and explored. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Initiated consortia planning to meet the new NYSED certification standards. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Tentative guidelines for practicum at varying specialization levels were outlines congruent with college/university specialization and field needs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Entry level knowledge of PBTE of the: | | | | | | |
| (a) administrators | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (b) college/university coordinators | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (c) school practicum supervisors | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (d) cooperating teachers | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (e) student teachers | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Terminal behavior re: knowledge of PBTE of administrators, college/university coordinators, school practicum supervisors cooperating teachers, and student teachers, is: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Availability of materials (books, preconference papers, publications) was: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. The assistance and guidance provided by the state education agency in clarifying and implementing PBTE was: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

10. Comments: